McMaster University
DigitalCommons@McMaster

Open Access Dissertations and Theses | Open Dissertations and Theses

7-1-1975

Three Studies in Non-Tantric Buddhist Cult Forms

Gregory Schopen

Recommended Citation

Schopen, Gregory, "Three Studies in Non-Tantric Buddhist Cult Forms" (1975). *Open Access Dissertations and Theses.* Paper 2582.
http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/opendissertations/2582

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Dissertations and Theses at DigitalCommons@McMaster. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@McMaster. For more information, please contact scom@mcmaster.ca.

THREE STUDIES IN NON-TANTRIC BUDDHIST CULT FORMS

Gregory Schopen
B.A.

July 4, 1975

A Thesis
Submitted To The School Of Graduate
Studies In Partial Fulfillment Of
The Requirements Of The Degree
Master of Arts

© GREGORY SCHOPEN 1976

THREE STUDIES IN NON-TANTRIC BUDDHIST CULT FORMS

MASTER OF ARTS (1975) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(Religious Sciences) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Three Studies in Non-Tantric Buddhist Cult Forms

AUTHOR: Gregory Schopen, B.A. (Black Hills State College)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Jan Yun-hua

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 203

SCOPE AND CONTENTS: This thesis attempts to present three separate but related bodies of material which might contribute towards the eventual establishment of a new basic descriptive category in the field of Buddhist Studies: non-tantric pūjā. The first part deals with a previously unacknowledged form of the relic-cult; the second, with an equally unacknowledged cult of the book; the third with the image-cult. A fourth part indicates a few problematic factors involved in future research in the area.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iv

Part One: MSVi 73ff: A TEXT-SOURCE FOR A PRE-STŪPA FORM OF THE RELIC CULT. 1

A. Addendum 58

B. Appendix 60

Part Two: THE PHRASE 'SA PṚTHIVĪPRADEŚAŚ CAITYABHŪTO BHAVET' IN THE VAJRACCHEDIKĀ: NOTES ON THE CULT OF THE BOOK IN MAHĀYĀNA. 75

Part Three: THE BHAIṢAJYAGURU-SŪTRA: A TEXT-SOURCE FOR THE CULT OF IMAGES 130

Conclusion 183

Bibliography 197

Preface

"It is very difficult, and perhaps unnecessary, to be humble about a work of objective importance."
—Agehananda Bharati—

Preface

The present work is intended as a contribution towards defining what amounts to a new descriptive category in the field of Buddhist Studies. Generally speaking, the process of defining a category may go in two directions. It may start with a statement of what one thinks the category might include, a true pre-conception, and then proceed to gather materials which support or 'prove' the validity of the articulated pre-conception. Or it may start by gathering materials of a related kind, slowly building up a mass of data the mere juxtaposition of which will gradually result in a broad notion of what 'related' in the phrase 'related kind' may and may not mean. The former method has the advantage of beginning with at least a provisionary descriptive vocabulary, we can label or name phenomena, and thus manipulation of the data is greatly facilitated. The disadvantage is that by naming we limit. By naming we have already appreciably reduced the potentially great richness and diversity of the material, perhaps already we begin to overlook important details because they do not appear in the costume of our name. The latter method, on the otherhand, exhibits the reverse of the situation. By refraining from pre-conception, by restricting naming to the application of non-interpretive labels, by gathering the largest possible body of data and limiting our operations to juxtaposition and the compilation of recurring elements, we in some sense allow the material to define itself. In terms of utility--the essential criterion of a descriptive

category--this is of considerable importance. The disadvantage here is that the data is not easily manipulated nor conclusions easily articulated. The difference, however, at this point between the two methods is instructive. It is difficult to conceive how what we described as the 'disadvantages' of the first method could be reformulated to appear as advantages. This is not the case with the second method. It is not difficult to see how its 'disadvantages' could in fact be disguised advantages. Clearly, the situation resulting from following the second method would serve as a badly needed block to the facile generalizations and conclusions which are so common in Buddhist Studies and in Indian Studies generally. By impeding the development of labels, it would serve to focus attention on the raw data itself, and this in turn would underline the severe problems which are encountered here: the absence of critical editions, the vast number of doubtful lexical items, the convoluted lines of manuscript traditions, etc. Anyone familiar with Buddhist Literature and History at the level of raw data knows that legitimate and meaningful generalization on the basis of much of this data as it now stands is out of the question. It is in light of these considerations that we have said 'the present work is intended as a contribution towards defining what amounts to a new descriptive category in the field of Buddhist Studies'. As the wording clearly indicates this will be a process of definition of the second type.

In accordance with procedure indicated for this type of definition we will in the following pages present three blocks of

related material, i.e., three sets of texts. As a reading of this material will show, the element common to them all is that each has as its central concern the articulation of one or more aspects of what the texts call *pūjā*. This term in its verbal form is often translated 'to worship', 'to honor', etc.; in noun form, in addition to 'worship', etc., it is often times translated--especially by scholars writing in French--as 'cult'. The 'exact' signification of the term is best approached by viewing its usages in the texts themselves (I have wherever possible left the term untranslated to facilitate such an approach.) There is one other feature--in this case a negative one--common to all three blocks of material: in none of them is the *pūjā* which is articulated connected with the use of *mantras*, *dhāraṇīs*, or *maṇḍalas*. For our present purposes--and only for these purposes--we might take the term 'tantric' as a shorthand expression for '*pūjā* connected with the use of *mantras*, *dhāraṇīs* and *maṇḍalas*.' It must be stressed that this is a working definition for the present analysis. Its validity outside of the present context will require a separate investigation. Its negative, the absence of a connection with mantras, etc. may then be indicated by 'non-tantric'.

With these preliminaries stated we can say that, at least, these three blocks of material, when juxtaposed, exhibit two features in common: 1) they have as their chief concern the articulation of one or more aspects of *pūjā*; and 2) the *pūjā* articulated is non-tantric. We can go further and say that within Buddhist Literature as a whole there is a category of texts, having so far three known members,

whose primary concern is the articulation of non-tantric forms of <u>pūjā</u>. Even this much is a great advancement over the current and general tendency to label anything vaguely cultic or ritualistic in Buddhist Literature as 'the beginnings of Tantricism' or 'the influences of tantric tendencies' or some other equally meaningless phrase. Even this much allows us to see that the material presented in the following pages belongs to a category (and probably a period?) of Buddhist 'cult' forms which is completely separate and distinct from the category 'tantric cult practice'. If, as we suspect, this three-membered category has a greater potential membership, and thus a more general application, to show this will require the accumulation of much larger quantities of material. This must be a future step.

So far we have been able to establish potentially a broad category and name it according to two defining characteristics. We have not yet given a specific content oriented definition, nor indicated possible sub-categories or types. Both aspects will emerge from a reading of the following pages. Neither, however, will be specifically articulated in terms of our category. Rather, we will present three independent studies which, taken together, will indicate the possible range of types and the more specific content of the category. These three studies will not result in any synthetic generalization. They are only meant to make available material which may, when greatly supplemented, make such generalization possible. This is an informational, not a theoretical work.

The first two parts establish the existence of two distinct (but related?) types of Buddhist cult, previously unstudied and

unacknowledged. The method here is fairly simple: for the first we confront six versions of a similar text--three Chinese versions, previously studied, and a Sanskrit, a Tibetan and a Pali version, previously unstudied--and draw some general conclusions on the basis of their inter-relationships; for the second we confront ten or so occurrences of a specific formula and their contexts in different texts and draw some general conclusions on the basis of their inter-relationships. In both cases the 'general conclusions' are limited to the material studied and are not intended as to establish definite categories or sub-categories. They are merely a first step toward the latter. For the first we have given considerable space to textual notes. This is intended as a small contribution towards any eventual critical edition of the larger texts of which they form a part.

The third part is made up of the translation of a Sanskrit text accompanied by a few notes. It is intended to serve as the basis for a more general study of image-pūjā in a Buddhist context. Since there is virtually no other substantial single text source for image-pūjā in extant Buddhist Sanskrit Sūtra Literature, the translation of this text appeared as an imperative first step.

In the fourth and concluding part we have been careful not to conclude anything. We reaffirm the need to be open to the new category suggested above, and then touch on a few important factors which must be taken into account in any future research in this area.

PART I: MSVi 73 ff: A TEXT-SOURCE FOR A PRE-STŪPA FORM OF THE RELIC CULT

...On peut dire avec autant d'exactitude que le *cetiya* n'est pas moins que les *Piṭakas* un exposé du bouddhisme.
—A.K. Coomaraswamy--

In 1881 H. Oldenberg in the single paragraph devoted to the Stūpa/Relic cult in his now classic work was able to conclude that, in reference to the Stūpa cult: "Die Mönchsgemeinde als solche hatte mit dieser pomphaften Verehrung nichts zu schaffen; die alten Gemeindeordnungen gedenken ihrer mit keinem Wort."[1] This view was, and perhaps in some quarters still is, accepted as essentially correct. But in recent years such a position -- based as it is solely on Pāli material -- has become impossible to maintain. Certainly much of the credit for establishing a more realistic perspective must go to A. Bareau who in 1960 published a long article entitled "La construction et le cult des stūpa d'après les Vinayapiṭaka"[2] which made readily available for the first time a considerable amount of material contained in the Chinese translations of the Vinaya literature. Work on this Chinese material has been continued by other scholars and a translation

---

[1] Hermann Oldenberg, Buddha, Sein Leben, Seine Lehre, Seine Gemeinde (Stuttgart: 1923, 424.)

[2] BEFEO 50 (1960) 229-74.

of the Stūpa section of the Chinese Mahāsānghika Vinaya has been promised. [3] But even before Bareau's article, with the publication of large portions of the Sanskrit versions of the Vinaya of the Mūla-Sarvāstivādin discovered at Gilgit a certain amount of material was already available which allowed a reassessment of the place of the Stūpa cult in Vinaya literature. [4] It is, however, unfortunate that the Gilgit Vinaya manuscripts are not complete and the portions corresponding to much of the material presented by Bareau have not been recovered. Bareau's data is basically of two types. First are the specific rules relating to the construction (materials to be used, proportions, location, etc.) and cult (types of offerings, cultic acts and proscriptions, etc.) of the stūpa; and, second, are the accounts of individual stūpas and their establishment. It is primarily data of the first kind which is either missing or has not yet been identified in the Gilgit Vinaya. There are, however, a number of accounts of individual stūpas preserved and it is with one of these that we will here be concerned.

---

[3] Gustav Roth "Buddhist Sanskrit Stūpa Texts from Nepal", paper read Inter. Cong. of Orient. Paris; 1974.

[4] N. Dutt, Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, pt. 1 (Srinagar: 1947); pt. 2 (Srinagar: 1942); pt. 3 (Srinagar: 1943); pt. 4 (Calcutta; 1950).

The first account of an individual Stūpa which Bareau presents he calls "Le stūpa du Buddha Kāśyapa", and says of it: "Cependant, certains indices laissent à penser que l'un au moins des récits, celui qui concerne le stūpa du Buddha Kāśyapa, peut remonter, dans sa version primitive, à une époque antérieure au règne d'Aśoka" (p. 230). His argument is as follows: "Cette légende paraît antérieure à Aśoka. En effet, l'inscription de Negali Sagar, datée du quatorze ans après le sacre de celui-ci, rapporte que ce roi agrandit du double le stūpa du Buddha Konākamana. Or, ce Buddha Konākamana était le second prédécesseur de Śākyamuni, Kāśyapa en étant le prédécesseur immédiat. Il semble que si Aśoka attribua le monument qu'il agrandit à Konākamana, et non à Kāśyapa comme il aurait dû le faire en bonne logique, c'est qu'une tradition répandue sous son règne plaçait le stūpa de ce dernier en un autre endroit, vraisemblablement au Kosala.... et non pas à Nigali Sagar...Un argument paraît appuyer notre point de vue. En effet, le Vinayapiṭaka des Mūlasarvāstivādin [T. 1451, p. 222c] attribue à un roi légendaire nommé Aśoka, et curieusement homonyme du grand souverain indien du IIIe siècle avant notre ère, la construction du stūpa du Buddha Krakucchanda dont il était contemporain. Or, ce Krakucchanda était le troisième prédécesseur de Śākyamuni, antérieur ainsi à Konākamana. Au fur et à mesure que l'on descend le cours du temps, on attribue donc à des Buddha plus anciens les légendes ou les monuments auxquels

on se réfère (p. 261)." Accordingly, if Bareau's position on this point were acceptable, then this account of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa would be of considerable importance for a history of the development of the Stūpa/Relic cult. But aside from the inherent difficulties of basing a historical argument on what someone might consider to be the requirements of "bonne logique", there are still other problems with Bareau's argument which we will come to deal with. First, however, we must make one thing clear. Regardless of how Bareau's argument holds up, the Aśokan edict cited by him establishes beyond a doubt that the cult of the previous Buddhas was in at least some form pre-Aśokan and that the Stūpas of Konākamana -- and by implication that of at least Kāśyapa -- had more than a merely literary existence and were probably actual cult centers. The literature which surrounds them must therefore be taken seriously as the traditional accounts associated with actual places and undoubtedly expresses views which were actually held by the early Buddhist community on the origin, etc., of certain sacred spots (This is later confirmed by the accounts of their travels left by Fa-Hsien and Hsüan-tsang). In this sense the accounts are historical documents and not simply literary inventions.[5]

---

[5] This last remark to some degree presupposes a certain view of "Buddhist History" a view beautifully expressed by É. Lamotte: "Il ne suffit pas d'écarter la légende pour trouver la réalité des faits. En laissant au merveilleux la place qu'il a toujours occupée dans les sources, on pense donner un reflet plus fidèle de la mentalité des disciples du Buddha. C'est cette mentalité qui constitue l'objet propre de notre enquête et non une fuyante et insaisissable certitude historique." É. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien (Louvain: 1958) X.

An account very similar to several versions of the account of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa given by Bareau is preserved in the Sanskrit text of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya found at Gilgit and in Tibetan in the corresponding section of the 'dul ba; the same account is also found in two separate places in the Divyāvadāna. This account, though obviously related to those of the Chinese Vinaya, differs radically on at least one crucial point. We give below a translation of the account based on the Gilgit Vinaya version and add a series of notes giving what variants occur in the two versions contained in the Divyāvadāna and in the Tibetan text.

Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya, Gilgit Manuscripts Vol. III, pt.1, pp. 73.16-79.2 [=G]; Divy (Cowell-Neil ed.) 76.10-80.9; (Vaidya ed.) 47.30-50.27 [=D1]; Divy. (Cowell-Neil) 465.10-469.18; (Vaidya) 303.13-306.20 [=D2]; 'dul ba 1, PTT 41-179.3.6 to 180.4.2 [=T].

Then, the Blessed One addressed the venerable Ānanda:[1] "We must go, Ānanda, to Toyikā".

"Just so, Reverend One", the venerable Ānanda assented to the Blessed One.[2]

Then the Blessed One reached Toyikā. And in that place a Brāhmaṇa was engaged in plowing. Then that [Brāhmaṇa] saw the Buddha, the Blessed One, ornamented with the thirty-two marks of a great man and his limbs brilliant with the eighty minor marks, adorned with a fathom of light [surrounding him], having brilliance surpassing a hundred thousand suns, like a moving mountain of jewels, entirely

beautiful. [3] He considered:[4] "If, having approached Gautama the Blessed One, I will salute [him] respectfully, there will be a loss [of time] for my work; but [if] not having approached, I will [not] respectfully salute, there will be a loss of merit. What would be the expedient [5] (upāya) by which for me there would not be a loss [of time] for my work nor, moreover, a loss in merit?" An idea occurred to him: "Surely [if] standing here I make respectful salutation not thus will there be a loss [of time] for work, nor, moreover, a loss in merit." Then even while still holding his goad [and] still standing there, he made a respectful salutation. Thus [6] he respectfully saluted the Buddha, the Blessed One.

Then the Blessed One addressed the Venerable Ānanda: mistaken, Ānanda, is this Brāhmaṇa. If of this one the correct knowledge and vision in himself would have arisen: "on this spot stand the undisturbed mass of relics [7] of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa," I by this one after having approached [this spot] would be respectfully saluted, [but also] thus by this one respectful salutation would be made to two Samyaksaṃbuddhas. [8] What is the reason for that? On this spot, Ānanda, the undisturbed mass of relics of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa stands.

Then the Venerable Ānanda having very quickly arranged his outer robe folded in four [on the ground] said this to the Blessed One: "Let the Blessed One sit on this arranged seat. Thus this spot of earth will have been used (paribhukta) by two Samyaksaṃbuddhas,

both by the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa and at present by the Blessed One."

Having sat down the Blessed One addressed the Bhikṣus: "Would you Bhikṣus like to see the undisturbed mass of relics of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa?"

[The Bhikṣus replied:] "Now, O Blessed One, is the time; now, O Well-Gone, is the occasion that the Blessed One [9] should show the undisturbed mass of relics of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa to the bhikṣus. The bhikṣus, having seen, will cause their hearts to be well disposed." [10]

[Thereupon] by the Blessed One a thought concerning the world was produced. [Now it is in the nature of things that on which occasion the Buddhas, the Blessed Ones, produce a thought concerning the world, on that occasion small ants, up to living creatures, through the thinking of the Blessed One, are aware of that thought. Nāgas consider: "For what reason is that thought concerning the world produced by the Blessed One?"] They see he desires to see the undisturbed mass of relics of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa, the Blessed One. [11]

Thereupon the undisturbed mass of relics of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa by him were raised up. Then the Blessed One addressed the bhikṣus: "Comprehend this sign (nimitta, rtags), bhikṣus! It will disappear." [12] [And] it disappeared.

[Then] by the Raja Prasenajit it was heard: "For the viewing of his disciples the undisturbed mass of relics of the Samyaksaṃbuddha

Kāśyapa were raised up [13] by the Blessed One." And having heard and being aroused by curiosity, he, together with his queen and sons, his ministers, his army, with townspeople and rural people, set out.[14] Thus also Virūḍhaka, Anāthapiṇḍada the householder, the master builders (sthapati) Ṛṣidatta and Purāṇa, Viśākhā, the mother of Mṛgāra [and] several hundred thousand living beings, being aroused by curiosity, set out together[15] being impelled by whatever[16] [were there] former roots of good. Meanwhile that [manifestation of relics] had disappeared. It was heard by them: "disappeared is that mass of relics of the Blessed One, the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa." And having heard that, then sorrow and dejection arose: "In vain was our coming." [17]

And [then] by a lay disciple (upāsaka) that spot was circumambulated. And through reflection [he] formed a thought thus: "From this walking on foot [around this spot],[19] how much merit will there be for me?"

Then the Blessed One for the sake of effecting the contentment [20] of that great body of men, and having known the thought through reflection of that lay disciple spoke this gāthā:

"A hundred thousand measures of gold from the Jāmbū
river are not equal to the one

Who at the shrines (caitya) of a Buddha, having a
believing mind, makes the walk [around] on
foot, one having understanding."

By another lay disciple moreover a ball of (fragrant) earth (mṛttikā) was placed on that spot. [And he] formed a thought thus: "So far, of such extent the merit of walking on foot [around this spot] was declared by the Blessed One. But [21] how great a merit will there be from [placing] this ball of (fragrant) earth?"

Then the Blessed One having known the thought through reflection of him, spoke this gāthā:

"A hundred thousand balls of gold from the Jāmbū
River are not equal to the one
Who at the shrines of a Buddha, having a believing
mind, would deposit a single ball of
(fragrant) earth."

Having heard that, the act of depositing a ball of (fragrant) earth was done by several hundred thousand living beings. By others plucked flowers were flung there. And [they] formed a thought thus:[22] "Of such extent the merit of walking on foot [around this spot] and of [depositing] a ball of (fragrant) earth [there] was declared by the Blessed One. But for us how great a merit from these plucked flowers will there be?"

Then the Blessed One, having known their thought through reflection, spoke this gāthā:

"A hundred thousand bags of the gold from the Jāmbū
River are not equal to the one
Who at the shrines of a Buddha, having a believing mind,
would deposit a heap of plucked flowers." [23]

[Still] others made the garland-walking [24] there. And [they] formed a thought thus: "Of such extent the merit from plucked flowers was declared by the Blessed One. [But] For us how great a merit will there be from [making] the garland-walk?"

Then the Blessed One, again having known their thought through reflection, spoke this gāthā:

> "A Hundred thousand carts of gold from the Jāmbū
> River are not equal to the one
> Who at the shrines of a Buddha, having a believing mind,
> makes the garland-walk, one having understanding".

By [still] others a row of lamps [25] was placed there. And [they] formed a thought thus: "Of such extent the merit of the garland-walk was declared by the Blessed One. [But] for us how great a merit will there be from this row of lamps?"

Then the Blessed One having known again their thought through reflection, spoke this gāthā:

> "A hundred thousand carts [26] of gold from the Jāmbū
> River are not equal to that one
> Who at the shrines of a Buddha, having a believing mind,
> makes a row of lamps, one having understanding."

By [still] others the anointing with perfume was given there. And [they] formed a thought thus: "Of such extent the merit of a row of lamps was declared by the Blessed One. Of us how great a merit will there be from this anointing with perfume?"

Then the Blessed one again having known their thought through reflection, spoke this gāthā:

"A hundred thousand piles of gold from the Jāmbū
River are not equal to the one
Who at the shrines of a Buddha, having a believing mind,
does the anointing with perfume,
one having understanding."

By [yet] others the act of raising umbrellas and flags and banners there was done. And [they] formed a thought thus: "Of such extent the merit of walking [around] on foot, of a ball of (fragrant) earth, of plucked flowers, of the garland-walk, of a row of lamps, of anointing with perfume, was declared by the Blessed One. Of us how great a merit will there be in raising umbrellas and flags and banners?" 27)

Then the Blessed One, again having known their thought through reflection, spoke this gāthā:

"A hundred thousand mountains of gold equal to Mt.
Meru are not equal to that one

Who at the shrines of a Buddha, having a believing mind,
would raise umbrellas and flags and banners.
For this was proclaimed an offering to immeasurable Tathāgatas,
Perfect Buddhas like the ocean, utmost caravan leaders. 28)

[Then] to them this occured: "Just now the merit from the pūjā 29) of a parinirvāṇed Blessed One was declared of such extent by the

Blessed One. How great a merit will there be [from the pūjā] of an abiding [Blessed One]?" 30)

Both he who would worship an abiding [Blessed One]
and he who would [worship one] parinirvāṇed,

In like manner having here made faithfull their mind 31)
[of them] there is no differentiation of merit.

For thus are the Buddhas unthinkable, moreover unthinkable are the dharmas of a Buddha;

Of those having faith in the unthinkable, again,
unthinkable is the result.
Of those unthinkable turners of the unobstructed wheel
of dharma, 32)
Of those Samyaksambuddhas, it is not possible to reach
the full limit of their qualities. 33)

There by the Blessed One such a demonstration of dharma was effected for that great body of men, having heard which great distinction was achieved by several hundred thousand living beings: by some thoughts were generated in the awakening (bodhi) of a disciple; by some in the awakening of a Pratyekabuddha; by some in utmost right and perfect awakening; by some was obtained [the stage called] 'become warm'; by some [that called] 'conformable to the true'; by some [that called] 'patience'; 34) by some the fruit of a stream winner was directly realized;

by some the fruit of a once returner; by some the fruit of a non-returner; by some, having renounced the household life, from the abandoning of all impurities, arhatship was directly realized. Wherefore that assembly was even further established in being inclined towards the Buddha, devoted to the dharma, disposed towards the samgha.[35) There by believing brāhmaṇas and householders on that spot a great festival (maha) was established. [Thus] the name (saṃjñā) "Festival of Toyikā, Festival of Toyikā" came about.[36)

Notes

1) G.D1: Āyuṣmantam ānandam āmantrayate; D2: Āyuṣmantam āmantrayate sma; T: tshe daṅ ldan pa kun dga' bo la bka' stsal pa.

2) G.D1: bhagavataḥ pratyaśrauṣīt; D2: bhagavato 'śrauṣīt; T: bcom ldan 'das kyi ltar mñan nas.

3) D2 reduces this to; athāsau dadarśa buddhaṃ bhagavantaṃ dvātriṃśatā mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṃkṛtagātraṃ pūrvavadyāvat samantato bhadrakam. T is also abbreviated but in a slightly different way: de nas bram ze des saṅs rgyas bcom ldan 'das sku skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum bcu rtsa gñis kyis kun nas brgyan pa / dpe byad bzaṅ po brgyad bcus brgyan pa źes bya ba nas kun nas bzaṅ ba mthoṅ ṅo źes bya ba'i bar goṅ ma bźin du'o /

4) G: sa saṃlakṣayati D1, D2: dṛṣṭvā saṃlakṣayati T: des bsams pa

5) G: Ko 'sāv upāyaḥ; D1, D2: tat ko'sāv upāyaḥ

6) D2: omits iti.

7) Āvikopito 'sthisaṃghāta; riṅ bsrel gyi tshogs ma źig par ; This expression is replaced a few lines down by āvikopitaṃ śarīrasaṃghātam. Cf. SP 240.10: ātmabhāvas tiṣṭhaty ekaghanas; 259.15: ekaghanaṃ cāsya śarīraṃ; Vkn. (PTT vol. 34, no. 843,100-3-5): mkhregs pa ma źig pa'i sku gduṅ; reconstructed by Lamotte (L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Louvain: 1962) p. 372) as: kaṭhore 'kuṇṭhite śarīra. and translated as: "corps solide et intact".

8) For the speech of the Buddha up to this point G has: Ksūṇa ānanda eṣa brāhmaṇaḥ/[anenopakramyāsmin pradeśe abhivādane kṛte] sati pratyātmaṃ jñānadarśanaṃ pravartate/etasmin pradeśe kāśyapasya samyaksaṃbuddhasyāvikopito 'sthisaṃghātas tiṣṭhatīti / aham anenopakramya vandito bhaveyam / evam anena dvābhyāṃ samyaksaṃbuddhābhyāṃ vandanā kṛtā bhavet/

This is a good example of the frustrations that can arise in working with the published versions of the Gilgit texts edited by N. Dutt. He encloses the phrase anenopakramyāsmin, etc., in brackets with no indication of whether it is a total or partial reconstruction, or if it is his own conjecture or based on some other source.

D2: kṣaṇa ānanda eṣa brāhmaṇaḥ saced asyaivaṃ samyak pratyātmajñānadarśanaṃ pravartate / etasmin pradeśe kāśyapasya samyaksaṃbuddhasyāvikopito 'sthisaṃghātas tiṣṭhatīti / athānenopasaṃkramya vandito bhaveyam, evam anena dvābhyāṃ samyaksaṃbuddhābhyāṃ vandanā kṛtā bhavet.

D1: bhavakṣayakaraḥ kṣaṇa eṣa [so Ms. A; kṣubhavakṣayakaraḥ na eṣa B; bhavakṣayakarakṣaṇa eṣa C; Ksūṇa eṣa D] brāhmaṇaḥ saced asyaivaṃ samyakpratyayajñāna darśanaṃ pravartate, etasmin pradeśe

kāśyapasya samyaksaṃbuddhasyāvikopito 'sthisaṃghātas tiṣṭhatīty aham anenopakrameṇa vandito bhaveyam, evam anena dvābhyāṃ samyaksaṃbuddhābhyām vandanā kṛtā bhavet

T: kun dga'bo bram ze 'dis ñes te/ gal te pha bi las phyogs 'di na yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas 'od sruṅ gi riṅ bsrel gyi tshogs ma źig par bźugs so sñam pa de lta bu'i so so raṅ gis rig pa'i ye śes śig yod par gyur na ṅa'i spyan sṅar 'oṅs te phag byas pa źig / de lta na pha bis yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas gñis la phag byas par 'gyur ba źig

Noting the uncertainty of G, the text can tentatively be established on the basis of the above material thus: Kṣūna ānanda brāhmaṇaḥ. Saced asyaivaṃ samyak pratyātmaṃ jñānadarśanaṃ pravartate: etasmin pradeśe kāśyapasya samyaksaṃbuddhasyāvikopito 'sthisaṃghātas tiṣṭhatīti. Aham anenopakramya vandito bhaveyam; evam anena dvābhyāṃ samyaksaṃbuddhābhyāṃ vandanā kṛta bhavet.

9) G: samayo yad bhagavān; D1: samayo yaṃ bhagavān; D2: samayo 'yaṃ bhagavān.

10) Cittam abhiprasādayiṣyanti; sems mṅon par dad par 'gyur lags so; could also be rendered 'will make their heart (or mind) full of faith'. Forms of the word (without abhi-) occur a number of times throughout our text and it is difficult to give them a consistent translation. I have translated prasannacitta as 'having a believing mind' and cittaṃ prasādya as 'having made faith-full their minds'. This situation is at best unfortunate.

11) G has here: bhagavatā laukikaṃ cittam utpāditam iti/paśyanti bhagavataḥ kāśyapasya samyaksaṃbuddhasya śarīrasaṃghātam avikopitaṃ draṣṭukāmāḥ. As it stands this is problematic. D1 has: tato bhagavatā laukikaṃ cittaṃ utpāditam/ dharmatā khalu yasmin samaye buddhā bhagavanto laukikaṃ cittam utpādayanti tasmin samaye kunta-pipīlikā api prāṇino bhagavataś cetasā cittam ājānanti/ nāgāḥ saṃlakṣayanti/ kiṃkāraṇaṃ bhagavatā laukikacittam utpāditam iti/ paśyanti kāśyapasya samyaksaṃbuddhasya śarīrasaṃghātam avikopitaṃ draṣṭukāma iti D2 differs from D1 only in having kuntapipīlikādayo 'pi for kuntapipīlikā api and utpāditam/bhagavān kāśyapasya, etc., for utpāditam iti/ paśyanti kāśyapasya, etc. T. has bcom ldan 'das kyis 'jig rten pa'i thugs bskyed par mdzad de/ chos ñid kyis gaṅ gi tshe saṅs rgyas bcom ldan das rnams kyis 'jig rten pa'i thugs bskyed pa de'i tshe srog tshags grog spur rnams kyis kyaṅ bcom ldan 'das kyi dgoṅs pa sems kyis śes par 'gyur bas klu rnams kyis bsams pa bcom ldan 'das gyis ci źig gi phyir 'jig rten pa'i thugs bskyed pa mdzad sñam na/ bcom ldan 'das yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas 'od sruṅ gi riṅ bsrel gyi tshogs ma źig pa gzigs par bźed par mthoṅ nas/ It might appear at first sight as if the version in G was originally without this formula and, since the formula is found elsewhere in D (63.11,161.23), that D added it to the text. But the presence in G of paśyanti which without reference to the full formula makes very little sense here, seems to indicate that some form of the formula was original to the text. This receives some

support from the fact that the full form of the formula in addition to being found in D is also found elsewhere in MSV (i 164. 3, 255.19) and from the fact that it is found in T. In light of this the absence of the formula in G may be either 1) a conscious abbreviation or 2) a scribal error. Against the first is the fact that such abbreviations are usually marked with peyālam, yāvat, etc; and the fact that the reading draṣṭukāmāḥ in G as a nom. pl. looks like an attempt to make sense out of the passage as it stands by making it agree with paśyanti. G's bhagavataḥ as gen. probably also reflects the same process, and D2 and T probably preserve the true reading: bhagavān kāśyapasya...draṣṭukāmaḥ; bcom ldan 'das yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas 'od sruṅ gi...gzigs par bźed pa(r) (Note bźed the form of respect). As a consequence the second alternative would seem to be the right one, so although we have in our translation bracketed the portion corresponding to that missing in G, it is probably to be assumed that it originally formed part of the text.

12) D1 omits iti; D2 has gṛhnīta for G. D1's udgṛhnīta, T zuṅ śig

13) G: ucchrāpita; D1: samucchritam; D2: ucchrāyita

14) G: śrutvā ca punaḥ kutūhalajātaḥ sārdham antaḥpurukumārair amātyair bhaṭabalāgreṇa naigamajānapadaiś ca samprasthitaḥ ; D1, D2: sārdham [D1 sahā-] antaḥpureṇa kumārair amātyair bhaṭabalāgrair naigamajānapadaiś ca draṣṭum samprasthitaḥ; T: thos nas kyaṅ yaṅ ṅo mtshar skyes nas btsun mo daṅ / gźon nu daṅ / blon po daṅ

khrom gyi ru pa dan / gron mi dan / yul mi rnams dan lhan cig chas so

15) D1, D2 again insert drastum

16) D1, D2 omit Kaiścit; T: kha cig

17) G: vṛthāsmākam āgamanam iti; D1, D2: both insert jātam before iti; T: bdag cag 'dir lhags pa dag ni don med par gyur to

18) D1, D2 begin the sentence with atha.

19) G. D1: padāvihārāt; D2 padā vihārāt; T: gom pa bor bas. An uncommon expression (See BHSD 505[1], 'vihāra'; index to CN's D 683), but here clearly a synonym for pradakṣinīkṛtaḥ.

20) G. D1: -āvipratisārasaṃjananārthaṃ; D2:-āvipratisārasaṃjanārthaṃ; T: 'gyod pa skyes pa bsal ba'i phyir

21) G, ~~D2:~~ asya tu; D1 anyatra; T: 'di la 'jim pa'i gon bu bźag pa'i bsod nams ji sñed cig tu gyur sñam pa dan . G. further supports J.S.Speyer, "Critical Remarks on the Text of the Divyāvadāna" Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 16 (1902) 111.

22) G: aparais tatra muktapuṣpāṇy abhikṣiptāni / evaṃ ca cittam abhisaṃskṛtam ; D1: aparais tatra muktapuṣpāṇy avakṣiptāny evaṃ ca cittam [but this is "Ex. conject.", The mss. reading eva ca kṣiptāṇy evaṃ cittam] abhisaṃskṛtaṃ; D2 has simply...mukta-puṣpāṇi kṣiptāny evaṃ cittam abhisaṃskṛtaṃ; T: gźan dag gis de la me tog sil mas gtor nas sems kyis 'di sñam du mnon par 'dus byas pa.

23) G: muktapuṣpasya rāśim; D1: muktasupuṣparāśim; D2: muktakapuṣparāśim; T: me tog sil ma spuns pas

24) mālāvihāra, me tog gi phreṅ bas bskor ba (elsewhere in this passage the gi of me tog gi is always omitted). Again an uncommon expression; see BHSD 505[1]: "garland-preambulation (?)". T. bskor ba= pradakṣiṇa, again implying that vihāra is a synonym of pradakṣiṇa. The T. however could also be understood as 'encircling with garlands of flowers'; Cf. A. Cunningham, The Stūpa of Bharhut (London: 1879) 110.

25) G, D2: dīpamālā; D1: pradīpamālā; T: mar me

26) G: Suvarṇavāhā; D1, D2: suvarṇakoṭyo; T: gser sraṅ bye ba. G here has repeated the reading of the immediately preceding verse, probably inadvertently.

27) So G, D2, T. D1 has only: aparais tatra cchattradhvajapatākāropaṇaṃ kṛtaṃ evaṃ ca cetasā cittaṃ ājñāya gāthāṃ bhāṣate.

28) This verse is omitted in D1 (see N. 30) and G and D2 preserve it in two slightly different versions:

G: eṣā hi dakṣiṇā proktā aprameye tathāgate /
samudrakalpe saṃbodhau sārthavāhe anuttare//

D2: eṣāṃ hi dakṣiṇā proktā/ aprameye tathāgate/
samudrakalpe saṃbuddhe sārthavāhe anuttare//

T: rgya mtsho lta bu'i rdzogs saṅs rgyas / de bźin gśegs pa tshad med pa/
ded dpon bla na med pa la / yon dú bśad pa de yin no/

The differences between G and D2 entail no difference in meter and it is therefore difficult to chose between the two versions. T. seems to indicate that the -e endings be taken as acc., but there are perhaps other possibilities. I am very unsure of this verse. Beginning with

this verse we have a new meter which is continued in the next and final set of verses. In translating I have followed G except that for saṃbodhau I have preferred saṃbuddhe, rdzogs saṅs rgyas.

29) G: kāraṇam; D2: pūjākāraṇād; T: bya ba byas pa('i). I have followed D2.

30) D1 omits both the preceding verses and this paragraph, and attaches the following verses to the preceding paragraph, although they are there clearly out of place.

31) G,D1: samaṃ cittam prasādyeha; D2: samaṃ cittaprasādena; T: 'di na sems rab dad byas nas.

32) G, D1: dharmacakravartinām; D2: °cakrapravartinām; T: chos kyi 'khor lo thogs pa med pa skor ba; cf. Speyer WZKM 16 (1902) 111.

33) On the last two verses see, S. Lévi, Mahākarmavibhaṅga et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Paris: 1932), 153 n.4; cf. Vaj. 16c.

34) G: kaiścid uṣmagatāni pratilabdhāni kaiścin mūrdhānaḥ kaiścit satyānuloma kaiścit kṣāntayaḥ; D1: kaiścin mūrdhāgatāni [Ms. mūrdhnā-°] kaiścin mūrdhānaḥ [Ms. mūrdhnānaḥ] kaiścid uṣnagatāny āsāditāni kaiścit satyānulomāḥ kṣāntayaḥ; D2: Kaiścid uṣmagatāni pratilabdhāni kaiścid mūrdhānaḥ [Ms. mūrdhnānaḥ] kaiścit satyānulomaḥ kṣāntayaḥ; T: kha cig gis ni dro bar gyur ba thob/ kha cig gis ni rtse mo / kha cig gis ni bden pa dan 'thun pa'i bzod pa dag./ On these attainments see Poussin Kośa VI, 163. This whole paragraph is a cliché found, with more or less variation, at Divy. 50, 209,226,271, etc.

35) D2 inserts sārdhaṃ.

36) So G, D2, T. D1 has: athānāthapiṇḍado gṛhapatir bhagavantam idam avocat / yadi bhagavān anujānīyād atra maham prajñāpayeyam / anujānāmi gṛhapate prajñāpayitavyam / tato'nāthapiṇḍadena gṛhapatinā mahaḥ prajñāpitaḥ toyikāmaha iti saṃjñā saṃvṛttā.

Additional Note: By making use of the three available Sanskrit versions and the Tibetan version a fairly reliable text may be established, with the exceptions noted above in note 8 and 28. In general the two versions in D are fairly close to G, and on at least two occasions are able to correct the latter, although overall G appears to represent the best text. The most notable divergence is not between the versions of D and the version of G, but between D2 and G as one group, and D1. This divergence occurs at the end of our text where D1 is at first considerably condensed (n.30) and then, in the final paragraph, is expanded by material with no counterpart in the other two (n.36). It appears that D2 is not a copy of D1 (although they sometimes share a reading which differs from G: ns. 4,5,15,17) and it is possible, though problematic, that D1 represents a separate redaction.

It should also be noted that there are a number of problems in the Tibetan version by itself which are not treated in our notes.

* * * *

Of the five accounts published by Bareau concerning the Stūpa of Kāśyapa, only three need concern us here; the other two belong exclusively to a separate tradition concerning the Stūpa of Kāśyapa built by the Rāja Kṛki.[6] Of these first three -- one Mahāsāṅghika, one Mahīśāsaka, one Dharmaguptaka -- Bareau says: "les trois premières versions sont étroitement apparentées et proviennent manifestement d'un même récit antérieur (p. 260)." For our purposes it is necessary to give a brief résumé of each of these accounts.

Mahāsāṅghika [T 1425 p. 497b]: The Buddha was travelling in Kośala. "Une brahmane" engaged in plowing sees him pass and renders homage to him. The Buddha smiles. Ānanda asks the reason for this smile. The Buddha replies that this Brāhmaṇa renders homage to two Buddhas. Ānanda asks which two. The Buddha replies that "il me rend hommage à l'endroit où, sous son bâton, se trouve le stūpa du Buddha Kāśyapa". The monks wish to see the stūpa; the Buddha makes it appear. The Brāhmaṇa says that since he belongs to the gotra of Kāśyapa, the stūpa belongs to him. The Buddha constructs a stūpa on this spot for the Buddha Kāśyapa. The monks ask authorization to give mud ("boue") for the project. The Buddha grants it and pronounces a gāthā praising such a gift. The Buddha renders homage to the stūpa. The monks ask for authorization to do likewise; it is granted with a similar gāthā. The same for a

---

[6] Bareau, 260; The only account of a Stūpa of Kāśyapa cited by Bareau as belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivādin is one of these two. Apparently either the Chinese translation of MSV does not contain a text corresponding to ours, or -- though unlikely -- Bareau has overlooked it. On the Stūpa of Kāśyapa built by the Rāja Kṛki, see below.

gift of flowers, and similar verses on the gift of the law and obtaining the path from hearing the law. The Brāhmaṇa obtains faith and feeds the community. Then Prasenajit "ayant appris que le Beinheureux avait construit un stūpa pour le Buddha Kāśyapa," goes to find the Blessed One taking with him seven cartloads of bricks. He salutes the Buddha and asks permission to enlarge the stūpa. The Buddha recounts a version of the story of the construction of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa by Kṛki. Prasenajit enlarges the stūpa. Then follow a series of rules on the construction, site, etc., of a stūpa — some at the request of Prasenajit some at the request of the monks -- each given with reference to the stūpa built by Kṛki taken as a model.

Mahīśāsaka [T. 1421. p. 172A]: The Buddha was travelling in Kośala with a group of 1250 monks; he reached a Brāhmaṇa village called Tou-i 都夷 "'ville-blessé, Nagaraviddha, ou 'ville de même espèce, Nagaravidhā?"). He sat down to rest at the side of the road under a śāla tree and "fit un mystérieux sourire". Ānanda asks the reason for it. The Buddha recounts "l'histoire de la princesse Mālinī et des dix songes prophetiques du Roi [禁寐, "Kin-mi, Kimmi" intended for Kṛki(?); See Bareau 265-67; Mv i 301 ff], and recounts how Kṛki built a stūpa for Kāśyapa "qui maintenant se trouvait dans le sol. Le Buddha fit alors surgir ce stūpa qui apparut à la communauté. Les reliques (śarīra) du corps de Kāśyapa étaient intactes." The Buddha takes a "boule de boue" and recits a verse on the value of such used for elevating a stūpa. He then places "quatre boules de boue à l'endroit où le stūpa avait disparu" and each of the 1250 monks does likewise. "Ce fut le premier stūpa élevé

alors sur le territoire du Jambudvīpa". Then follow instructions on the construction and cult of the Stūpa.

Dharmaguptaka [T.1428, p. 958A]: The Buddha travelling in Kośala with 1250 monks comes to the Brāhmaṇa village Tou-tseu (都子 "ville-enfant, Nagaraputra?"). The Buddha smiles. Ānanda asks why. The Buddha says that on this spot the "roi du pays de ch'eu-p'i-k'ia-cheu (翅毗伽尸, Śibikāśi?)" built a stūpa for Kasyapa. "Le Buddha se rendit, tout près de là, dans un champ que labourait un cultivateur" and gets a bowl of mud, returns, and places it on that spot. He then recites a gāthā comparing a 100,000 necklaces of gold with a bowl of mud used to build a stūpa; the same verse is repeated 6 times, each time with a change in the quantity of gold. "Alors, les moines et les nonnes et les laïcs des deux sexes placèrent chacun une boule de boue à cet endroit et construisirent un grand stūpa."

It is clear even in résumé form that these three versions are both related to our Sanskrit text and yet at certain points crucially different. Perhaps the most noticeable difference between the Chinese translations and our Sanskrit text is the fact that the former are all accounts either of the 'appearance' and construction of a stūpa or, simply, of the construction of one; while the latter is concerned first with the 'appearance' of a "mass of relics" (asthisamghāta) at a certain spot or place (pradeśa), and secondly with the establishment of a festival (maha) at that pradeśa. Although the Sanskrit text uses the term buddhacaitya, it is here used in the plural as a generic term for a group of things of which the pradeśa in question is, apparently, only one example.

Even if the *pradeśa* could be taken as the sole referrent of *buddha-caitya*, still the difference between the Chinese versions and the Sanskrit text could not be explained as resulting from a confusion of the terms "*stūpa*" and "*caitya*". All the Chinese accounts refer explicitly to 'constructing' or 'erecting'; that is, we are dealing with a 'structure' of some kind. The Sanskrit on the other hand is describing the sacralization of a place or spot; there is no reference to 'constructing' or a 'structure' or a stūpa. If we assume -- as we will try to indicate below -- that the Sanskrit version represents the oldest form of the account, then we are perhaps able to see how at least the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka accounts have taken one incident from the Sanskrit version and by altering it and making it the central incident, produced a new account. Our Sanskrit text says, in describing only one of several acts of devotion directed towards the *pradeśa*, that a lay disciple placed a ball of (fragrant) earth on that spot and then wondered about the amount of merit resulting from such an act. The Buddha in the standard *gāthā* says that such an act is of great value. Then "having heard that, the act of depositing a ball of (fragrant) earth was done by several hundred thousand living beings." We of course would not want to deny that if this sentence is taken literally, the procedure it describes would have resulted in a considerable pile. But the text is referring to a ritual act, not an act of construction, and it certainly does not connect the presumed pile (the text never refers to the result of the act) with a stūpa. Yet

this appears to be exactly what the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka versions have done, and it is not difficult to see how with a little adjustment, the incident in our Sanskrit text could do service as a description of the construction of a stūpa. As we have seen above, both the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka reduce the narrative of the Sanskrit version to basically three elements: 1) an introduction -- the Buddha arrives at a certain spot and smiles; 2) an explanation of the smile -- the story of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa; the Mahīśāsaka version, but not that of the Dharmaguptaka, retains here reference to the Buddha causing the stūpa to arise; 3) the placing of a bowl of mud on the spot, first by the Buddha, then by the monks. This last element certainly is patterned on the placing of a ball of earth on the spot by a single upasāka, then by a 100,000 living beings, as recorded in our Sanskrit text. But then both Chinese versions add an element with no parallel in the Sanskrit. The Dharmaguptaka version after having said the monks, etc., placed a bowl of mud there adds: "et construisirent un grand stūpa." The Mahīśāsaka after giving a similar account, adds: "Ce fut le premier stūpa élevé alors sur le territoire du Jambudvīpa." By slight adaptations and by neglecting all but one of the series of ritual acts described in the Sanskrit version, by making this one the central element of the narrative and by making specific the results of that ritual act, the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka accounts have finished by fashioning a new version of the old tale. The process of adaptation

is transparent once the Sanskrit text is taken into account. [7]

---

[7]The Mahāsāṅghika account is more complicated. It has retained more of the narrative as found in the Sanskrit: i.e., rendering homage to the stūpa, giving flowers and perfumes, the arrival of Prasenajit (although here at a different point in the narrative); but has also added more: gāthās on the gift of the law, on obtaining the way, etc. Its exact relationship to the Sanskrit version requires fuller study, but there is no doubt that it, like the other two, is concerned with the appearance and construction of a stūpa, and in this differs in a basic way from the Sanskrit.

There is here in reference to the entire passage one other point which suggests itself. This concerns the fact that the development in the different accounts of this incident may perhaps present us with an important linkage in the development of the stūpa as a monumental form. From the fact that the text represented by the Chinese translations clearly associates the act of depositing balls or bowls of earth at a sacred spot with the construction of a stūpa, it is perhaps not impossible to see in this ritual act a probable origin of the stūpa as an independent structure. The act as described in our Sanskrit text is relatively simple. An individual deposits a ball of (fragrant) earth (mṛttikā) at a certain place where tradition locates the remains -- presumably buried -- of a great saint (in this case a Buddha). From the repetition of such an act an earthen mound would eventually result, the size of which would depend on the frequency of the act and this in turn would probably depend on the relative sanctity attaching to the individual whose remains were being honored. To suggest -- following the direction taken by the Chinese translations of the account -- that the resulting earthen mound was in fact a kind of proto-stūpa does not seem totally unreasonable. The possibility requires further study. For the moment we cite one interesting text from the Jātaka books which may have some bearing on the point. The text is Jātaka iii 155.18 23:

> Tassa Vayappattassa pitāmaho kālam akāsi. Ath' assa pitā pitu kālakiriyato paṭṭhāya sokasamappito āḷāhanato aṭṭhīni āharitvā attano ārāme mattikathūpaṃ katvā tāni tattha nidahitvā gatagatavelāya thūpaṃ pupphehi pūjetvā āvajjanto paridevati, n' eva nahāyati na vilimpati na bhuñjati na kammante vicāreti.

The reference here to a mattikathūpa (Skt. mṛttikā-stūpa) is perhaps supportive of our suggestion.

For early stūpa archaeological evidence see D. Mitra, Buddhist Monuments (Calcutta: 1971) 75; 84.

The next point to be noted, and one which seems to establish beyond any real doubt the priority of the Sanskrit version, concerns the reference to the Rāja Kṛki. Buddhist Sanskrit literary tradition consistently associates the Buddha Kāśyapa, and especially his funeral and the deposition of his bodily remains, with the Rāja Kṛki of Benares. Hofinger says: "A Vipaśyin, le Buddha du quatre-vingt-onzième kalpa, les textes associent invariablement la ville de Bandhumatī, où règne le roi Bandhumat. De même, au souvenir du Buddha Kāśyapa, prédécesseur immédiat de Śākyamuni, est lié celui du roi Kṛki (ou Kṛṣi, ou Kṛkin, etc.) et de sa capitale Bénarès. C'est ce monarque qui prit soin des funérailles du maître, recueillit du bûcher les restes vénérés, les déposa dans une urne d'or et fit construire pour y placer l'urne un stūpa fait des quatre joyaux."[8] Not only is this association 'invariable', but accounts of, or reference to the Stūpa of Kāśyapa Buddha built by the Rāja Kṛki are fairly widespread: MSV i 191, 195, 200; ii 77-78; iv 190-93 = Divy. (CN) 22-24; Avadānaśataka ii 76; 124-25; Avadānakalpalatā i 95 (vs. 147-48); 145 (vs. 132-33) 279 (vs. 16-17); Ratnamālāvadāna 132; etc. Now of the three Chinese versions we are concerned with here, though none of them places the stūpa in Benares,

[8] M. Hofinger, Le congrès du lac Anavatapta I: Légendes des anciens (Sthavirāvadāna) Louvain: 1956, 225 n. 1.

all of them make in some form the traditional association between the Stūpa of Kāśyapa and the Rāja Kṛki.[9] In light of all this it is significant that our Sanskrit version -- although the remains of Kāśyapa Buddha play a dominant role in its narrative -- knows nothing of either a Stūpa of Kāśyapa or of a Rāja named Kṛki -- or any other Rāja -- who made a stūpa for his remains. This is a strong indication that our Sanskrit version reflects a state of the tradition which is earlier than both that which is reflected in the "corresponding" Chinese versions and that reflected in all the accounts which have connected the remains of Kāśyapa Buddha with Kṛki. In this connection it is worth repeating that the Chinese versions and the Sanskrit references associating Kṛki with Kāśyapa's remains are accounts of the founding of a stūpa, while our Sanskrit text -- perhaps the original of at least some of these -- is the account of the founding of a festival. It is also worth noting that the Chinese versions hold an intermediate position between our Sanskrit text and the later Sanskrit references: they refer to the association of Kṛki and the Stūpa of Kāśyapa, but in placing that stūpa at Tou-i or Tou-tseu (see below) and not at Benares, they retain perhaps a vestige of an older tradition.

---

[9] This assumes that the Śibikāśi? of the Dharmaguptaka is somehow connected with Kṛki; on the varied Chinese transcriptions of the name see Hofinger, Le Congrès 225 n. 1; also Bareau 261.

If the account of the stūpa built by Kṛki did not form a part of the original redaction, there is at least one other element found in the later versions which probably falls into the same category. In the Sanskrit version the Buddha, after the Brāhmaṇa has saluted from a distance, remarks, without being asked, that if this Brâhmaṇa had only known that the relics of Kāśyapa were preserved on the same spot that the present Buddha was standing on, he could have, by approaching, saluted two Buddhas, etc. In all the Chinese versions this information comes to light in quite a different way: in all three Chinese accounts the Buddha comes to the spot, then smiles, and Ānanda then asks the reason for this smile. In response to Ānanda's question the Buddha tells him that the remains of Kāśyapa Buddha (in these accounts, his stūpa) are preserved here, etc. The handling of this incident in the Sanskrit is straight forward and there is nothing artificial about it. This cannot be said of the Chinese accounts: the Buddha's smile and the consequent disclosure of some past event, etc., as the cause of his smile is a literary cliché and is found for example at Anguttara iii 214, Majjhima ii 45,74 (cf. Saṃyutta ii 254, Vinaya iii 105); Mahāvastu i 317; Divy. 67 ff, 138 ff, 265 ff, etc. It appears that the Chinese versions in deviating from the description of the incident preserved in our Sanskrit text have done so only to conform to a standard literary cliché. For further support of our suggestion two of the references just cited are of some interest, one is the Pali version (Majjhima ii 45),

one the Sanskrit version (Mahāvastu i 317) of the same basic narrative. For reasons of space we cite only Majjhima ii 45 and that in I. B. Horner's translation:

> "At one time the Lord was walking on tour among the Kosalans together with a large order of Monks. Then the Lord, turning aside from the road, smiled (when he came to a) certain place. Then it occurred to the Venerable Ānanda: 'What is the cause, what the reason that the Lord is smiling? Not without motive do Tathāgatas smile'. Then the Venerable Ānanda, having arranged his robe over one shoulder, having saluted the Lord with joined palms, spoke thus to the Lord: 'Now, revered Sir, what is the cause, what the reason that the Lord is smiling? Not without motive do Tathāgatas smile.'
>
> Once upon a time, Ānanda, in this district [imasmiṁ padese] there was a village township called Vebhaliṅga, prosperous and wealthy and crowded with people. And Ānanda, the Lord Kassapa, perfected One, fully Self-Awakened One, lived depending on the village township of Vebhaliṅga. At that time, Ānanda, the Monastery [ārāma] of the Lord Kassapa...was here [idha sudaṁ].

> At that time Ānanda, the Lord Kassapa...
> instructed an order of monks while he was
> seated here.[10]

When the Chinese translations of our Sanskrit text are put alongside this Pāli passage (and its parallel in the *Mahāvastu*) it will be seen that their introductory passages have in common a standard form unknown to the Sanskrit text itself. And when we consider both this Pali passage and the other references cited above it becomes apparent that the smile of the Buddha and the subsequent relating of its cause is a favorite and stock device used to proclaim

---

[10] I. B. Horner, *The Middle Length Sayings* II (London: 1957) 243. In the *Mahāvastu* the introduction is told in slightly different terms. There is an additional sequence where after Ānanda observed the Buddha's smile he first goes and reports it to his fellow-monks. Then returns to question the Buddha. In the latter's reply not only is this spot (here the term is *pṛthivīpradeśa*) said to be the site of Kāśyapa's *ārāma*, but also his *kuṭī* and his *cankramaśala* and not only was it the seat (*niṣadya*) of Kāśyapa Buddha but also of the Buddhas Krakucchanda and Kanakamuni. E. Senart, *Le Mahāvastu*, T.1 (Paris: 1882) 317 ff; J. J. Jones *The Mahāvastu*, vol. I (London: 1949) 265 ff; see esp. his notes 1 & 2 on p. 266 where he suggests certain emendations to Senart's text. It is a detail of some interest that both the present Pāli passage and its parallel in the *Mahāvastu* have preserved a detail found in our Sanskrit text which, to judge from Bareau's descriptions, is missing in the Chinese versions. In our Sanskrit text after the Buddha has announced that the "undisturbed mass of relics" of Kāśyapa Buddha are present on this spot, *Ānanda laghu laghveva caturguṇam uttarāsaṅgaṃ prajñapya bhagavantam idam avocat: niṣīdatu bhagavān prajñapta evāsane. Evam ayaṃ pṛthivīpradeśo dvābhayam samyaksaṃbuddhābhyāṃparibhukto bhaviṣyati yac ca kāśyapena samyaksaṃbuddhena yac caitarhi bhagavateti. niṣaṇṇo bhagavān prajñapta evāsane.* Now *Majjhima* ii 45, immediately after the passage quoted above, says: *Atha kho āyasmā Ānando catuggunā saṁghāṭiṁ paññāpetvā bhagavantaṁ etad avoca: -- tena hi bhante, bhagavā nisīdatu. Evāyaṁ bhūmippadeso dvīhi arahantehi sammāsambuddhehi paribhutto bhavissatīti. Nisīdi bhagavā paññate āsane.* The *Mahāvastu* version, though again somewhat more elaborate, in its basic form has the same marked verbal similarity.

a past connection with a place, etc., and a Buddha, or even a disciple (Saṃyutta ii 254). Again, the fact that our Sanskrit text does not use this device in a narrative situation where similar accounts do, is perhaps another indication of its relative priority; and the divergence on this point between the Chinese and Sanskrit versions is to be accounted for by the former's having adapted the old account to conform to a more "classical" narrative structure. We should state here, however, what we have assumed all along; that is that it is unlikely that this "adaptation", as well as others already mentioned, were the work of the Chinese translators. It is more likely a case of them having before them a recension of the text in which these "adaptations" had already taken place. That is to say that the Chinese translations probably reflect a Sanskrit text at a later stage than that preserved in MSV and Divy.[11]

---

[11] For the introductory narrative of our Sanskrit text I have been able to locate only one passage which — though not a "parallel" — has some elements in common. It is found as a part of the account preserved in Divy of the coming of Maitreya and refers to the tradition according to which the Bhikṣu Kāśyapa had entered bodily into Mt. Gurupādaka, there to await Maitreya's arrival. The passage in question reads: Tato maitreyo samyaksaṃbuddho 'śītibhikṣukoṭivāro yena gurupādakaḥ parvatas tenopasaṃkramiṣyati yatra kāśyapasya bhikṣor asthisaṃghāto 'vikopitas tiṣṭhati / gurupādakaparvato maitreyāya samyaksaṃbuddhāya vivaram anupradāsyati / yato maitreyaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhaḥ kāśyapasya bhikṣor avikopitam asthisaṃghātaṃ dakṣiṇena pāṇinā gṛhītvā vāme pāṇau pratiṣṭhāpyaivaṃ śrāvakāṇāṃ dharmaṃ deśayiṣyati / (Divy. (CN) 61.19-21. This same tradition is referred to by both Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang; see Beal, Buddhist Records of the Western World (London: 1884) LXVI; ii 142.

There are a number of other differences in detail between the Chinese translations and our Sanskrit text, almost all of which point in the direction of those already studied, and which we will not pursue here. In reference to the Sanskrit text in itself, however, there remain a number of points of interest.

The Sanskrit version appears to be a very old account both for the reasons we have indicated above (i.e. lack of reference to Kṛki or to a stūpa, etc.), but also from certain elements not yet discussed. First of all there is the unusual vocabulary, terms such as padāvihāra and mālāvihāra used, presumably, to describe some kind of ritual perambulation. These are not standard and are perhaps unique to our text. Secondly, the geographical setting of the account is unusual. BHSD 527 is able to cite only our text and one other (which itself probably alludes to our text) which refers to Toyikā (Tib. chu maṅs.). BHSD refers to it as the name of a town, but our text never refers to it as a town or a city, only as a pradeśa, and indicates that it was either in or very close to cultivated fields. On the other hand the connection of Toyikā with King Prasenajit and the territory of Kośala is attested to both by our text and by MSVii 143, the one other place it seems to be referred to. As we have seen above the versions of our text of G and D2 conclude by saying tatra śrāddhair brāhmaṇagṛhapatibhis tasmin pradeśe mahaḥ sthāpitaḥ / toyikāmahas toyikāmaha iti saṃjñā saṃvṛttā (D1 attributes this to Anāthapiṇḍada). It is more than likely that MSVii 143 is referring to just this festival when it says: Śrāvastyām

nidānam/ yadā rājñā prasenajitā kośalena toyikāmahaḥ prasthāpitas tadā tatra bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikānām mahāsannipato bhavati: 'The introduction in Śrāvasti [i.e., the Buddha dwelt in Śrāvastī, etc.]. When by the Rāja Prasenajit of Kośala the Toyikā festival was celebrated ('established'?) a great assembly of monks, nuns, laymen and women was there.' Dutt in his introduction to MSVii (p.xix) seems to take Toyikāmaha in its literal sense (assuming that toyikā is derived from Skt. toya) as "a water festival" rather than as 'a festival held at Toyikā; but this seems unlikely, and in light of our text, and the fact that the tatra of MSVii 143, judging from what follows in the story, cannot possibly refer to Śrāvastī, and therefore must refer to Toyikā, it seems necessary to understand MSVii 143 as referring to a festival held at Toyikā; i.e., the same festival that is referred to in our text. Even so, this is scanty information and Toyikā remains an obscure place name in the territory of Kośala. Both our text and MSVii 143 seem to indicate that it was probably not too far from Śrāvastī, but little else. It is at this point that it is of some interest to look at yet another version of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa, one which presents a similar geographic puzzle.

Dhammapadaṭṭhakatha iii 250-35 under the title Kassapadasabalassa Suvaṇṇacetiyavatthu has preserved what appears to be the Pāli version of the tradition preserved in one form in our Sanskrit text and its Tibetan translation, and in a somewhat different form in the Chinese translations of the Vinaya. This Pāli version is again somewhat

different from both. It is in its present form manifestly the latest of all. We give here a translation based on the edition of H. C. Norman (London: 1906-14: PTS) followed by a few notes.

[1] The Account of the Gold Cetiya[2] of Kassapa-Dasabala[3]

This discourse on dhamma entitled "Worthy of Worship" the teacher, travelling his round, related in reference to the gold cetiya of Kassapa-Dasabala.

The Tathāgata, having departed from Sāvatthi, gradually going to Bārānasi, on the way near the village of Todeyya,[4] surrounded by a great community of bhikkhus, came to a certain deva-place.[5] The Sugata seated there, having sent the Treasurer of the Dhamma [i.e. Ānanda],[6] he summoned a Brāhmaṇa doing the plowing nearby. That Brāhmaṇa having come, not having saluted the Tathāgata, but having honored that deva-place, stood [there].

The Sugata said: "How do you regard this spot (padesa), Brāhmaṇa?"

[He replied]: "Friend Gotama, I honor this place (thāṇa) as a cetiya handed down from a tradition of ours.[7]

The Sugata praised him [saying] "Brāhmaṇa, good is done by you honoring this place."

Having heard that, the Bhikkhus experienced a doubt: "What is the reason the Blessed One praised [this Brāhmaṇa] thus?"

Thereupon the Tathāgata, to remove their doubts, having spoken the Ghaṭīkārasuttanta of the Majjhima-Nikāya,[8] through the might of his magic power having created in the sky, like a gold mountain,

another gold cetiya a yojana in height of Kassapa Dasabala, [9] having pointed to the multitude, [10] having said: "Brāhmaṇa, even more fit is the worshipping of such as are worthy of worship," having explained the four worthy of a thūpa, the Buddha, etc., through the manner indicated in the Mahāparinibbāna-Sutta, [11] having illustrated in detail the three cetiyas, "the relic cetiya, the commemorative cetiya, the cetiya of things used," [12] he spoke these verses:

Of one worshipping those worthy of worship,
Buddhas or disciples
Having passed beyond illusions, having overcome
sorrow and lamentation;
Of one worshipping those of such quality, nibbāned,
having no fear anywhere,
It is not possible to calculate this much merit
by anything whatever.

[Then follows the usual word by word commentary on these verses.]

At the end of this discourse the Brāhmaṇa was a streamwinner. The gold cetiya a yojana in extent stood in the sky for seven days, and there was a great assembly. They for seven days by various ways worshipped the cetiya. Thereupon the dissension of views of those having dissenting views arose; through the Buddha's might that cetiya was returned to just its proper place, [13] and just there [in place of it] at that moment there was a great stone cetiya. [14] In that assembly, of eighty-four thousand living beings there was a realization of dhamma.

* * * *

Notes

1) A somewhat loose translation of this account was published years ago in Burlingame's translation of the 'legends" in the Dhammapadatthakatha (=DhA), Buddhist Legends. pt. 3 [HOS vol. 30] (Cambridge, Mass.: 1921) 68-69. On the ascription of DhA to Buddhagosha there is considerable doubt. See Burlingame, ibid., pt. 1 59-60; Malalasekera, The Pāli Literature of Ceylon (Colombo: 1928) 95-98; Adikaram, Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon (Colombo: 1946) 6.

2) The literature surrounding the remains of Kassapa Buddha which is preserved in Pāli sources seems -- although not yet systematically studied -- to differ on some points with the Sanskrit. Pāli literature knows the association between the Stūpa of Kassapa and Kikī (Skt. Kṛki) but the latter is there given a less prominent role. On the other hand reference to a cetiya of gold of Kassapa, as here in DhA iii 250, is frequently met with in Pāli sources (at least three other times in DhA alone: iii 29, iv 64; 189), while a fairly persistent feature of the Skt. accounts is reference to the stūpa being made of the four precious things (See MSV ii 77; iv 190 = Divy. 22; Avadānaśataka ii 76, etc.). These divergent traditions must be studied at a latter time. For some references to the cetiya of Kassapa see Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names (= DPPN) vol. I (London: 1936) 544-547.

3) DPPN i 544 says that the epithet dasabala is used of the Buddha Kassapa to distinguish him from other Kassapas, but BHSD 182[a] calls this suggestion into question.

4) Tathāgato sāvatthito nikkhamitvā anupubbena bārāṇasiṃ gacchanto antarāmagge todeyyagāmassa samīpe. . .

5) devaṭṭhānam; see Mil. 91, 330 (esp. I. B. Horner, Milinda's Questions Vol. I [SBB 22] London: 1964, 127 n.4; A. K. Coomaraswamy Yakṣas, pt. I (Washington: 1928) 43 on yakṣasthāna). Burlingame translates this term and cetiya and thūpa all simply as "shrine".

6) dhammabhaṇḍāgārika: an epithet for Ānanda; DPPNi 262.

7) amhākaṃ paveṇiyā āgatacetiyaṭṭhānaṃ vandāmi bho gotamā ti.

8) Mii 45 ff; This is the same text the introductory passage of which we cited above (p. 31) because of its similarity with the introductory passages of the Chinese "translations" of our Skt. text. Its presence here perhaps lends some weight to our previous remarks on the process of the adaptation of the old account, although the adaptation here is much cruder: the insertion of the new account into the older one without any real attempt to join the two.

9) iddhānubhāvena kassapadasabalassa yojanubbedhaṃ kanakacetiyaṃ aparaṃ iva [vl. aparim iva; aparamiñ ca; aparañ ca] kanakapabbataṃ ākāse nimmāya; Burlingame: "Then by the supernatural power of his magic, he created in the air a mountain of gold, a double, as it were, of the golden shrine of the Buddha Kassapa." The point of interest here is that the sense of apara (in itself not textually over secure) seems to imply that this is another or second golden cetiya of Kassapa. This perhaps reflects an attempt to harmonize the present account with the apparently well known tradition associating the golden cetiya

of Kassapa with Bārāṇasi (see above N.2 for references). It is perhaps for the same reason that the present text in its conclusion specifies that it was a stone cetiya (pāsaṇa°) -- not a golden one -- which remained on the spot.

10) The problem here is whether mahājanaṃ equals the mahābikkhusaṃgha of the introductory section. Burlingame has clearly understood it so and for mahājanaṃ dassetvā brāhmaṇa evaṃvidhānaṃ pūjārahānaṃ pūjā yuttarā vā ti vatvā, he has: "Then, pointing to the numerous company of his disciples, he said: 'Brahman, it is even more fitting to render honor to men who are so deserving of honor as these.'" Now, although this is a paraphrase and not a translation of the original Pāli, it is not impossible that he has rendered in some sense the meaning intended by the text. Against this is the fact that immediately following this passage the four who are thūpāraha are enumerated with the strong suggestion that it is they who are the pūjāraha of the passage under discussion. The gāthās which follow also suggest this.

11) Dīgha ii 142; cf. Anguttara ii 245; i 77; iii 62.

12) sarīracetiyaṃ uddissacetiyaṃ paribhogacetiyaṃ ti tīṇi cetiyāni. Adikaram (EHBC. 135) considers uddissacetiyaṃ here an interpolation and this receives some support from the Ms. Cf Jātaka iv 228; Paramatthajotika (PTS) 221-22.

13) buddhānubhāvena taṃ cetiyaṃ yathāṭṭhānam eva gataṃ. Burlingame: "By the supernatural power of the Buddha that shrine returned to its original place."

14) See note 9.

* * * *

If the obvious interpolations (reference to the Ghaṭīkāra and Mahāparinibbāna Suttas, to the tīṇi cetiyāni, etc.) are bracketed in the account of DhAiii 250, it is sufficiently obvious that we have here a Pāli version of our Sanskrit text. Though in some instances it has handled them differently, it has preserved the basic elements, sometimes more faithfully even than the text represented by the Chinese translations: the Buddha wandering about, the Brāhmaṇa plowing the fields, the incompleteness of the latter's salutation, the Buddha's manifestation of the remains of Kassapa (here in the form of a cetiya), their disappearance, verses on the merit of pūjā, spiritual attainment of a large audience. In its basic outline, then, the Pāli version stands as a kind of paraphrase -- with a tendency toward omission -- of our Sanskrit text.[12] We will not here take up for discussion the differences between the Sanskrit and Pāli versions. This, for one thing, would require a fuller study of the Pāli material on the remains of Kassapa; for another, perhaps the major differences are "easily" attributable to the manifest lateness of the Pāli account as we have it. What is of more interest for the moment in having recognized in DhAiii 250 a Pāli version of our Sanskrit text is the geographical information presented by the former.

---

[12]See Burlingame, pt.1, 26-8 on the general character of the handling of his story material by the compiler of DhA.

The Pāli account is set at a devaṭṭhāna near the village of Todeyya (Todeyyagāmassa samīpe), the latter being situated on a route from Sāvatthi to Bārāṇasi (Sāvatthito nikkhamitvā anupubbena bārāṇasiṃ gacchanto antarāmagge). Todeyya as a place name -- parallel to the Toyikā in our Sanskrit text -- appears to be referred to only in connection with this account of the remains of Kassapa (DPPN i 1039). Further, DhAiii 250, by associating the remains of Kassapa with Todeyya, contradicts the "classical" tradition of the Pāli sources which invariably associates them with Bārāṇasī (see notes to the trans. 2 for references, 9 for DhA's apparent uneasiness in presenting this association). This exactly parallels the situation of our Sanskrit text in reference to the "classical" tradition of the Sanskrit sources. DhAiii 250 (in spite of its otherwise late appearance) like our Sanskrit text, appears to have preserved an older "pre-classical" form of the tradition. Given their occurrence in parallel contexts in parallel texts and their parallel position in relation to their respective "classical" traditions, plus the fact that both refer to a place, more or less close to Śrāvastī, it appears fairly certain that Todeyya

and Toyika represent different forms of the same name.[13] However, whether it be called Todeyya or Toyikā, still we are obviously not dealing with a famous or even well-known place of Buddhist India. The Pali account, assuming the equivalence of Todeyya with Toyikā, adds to our knowledge only the fact that Todeyya/Toyikā lay somewhere on a route between Śrāvastī and Bārāṇasī.

We have up to this point ignored the geographical references in the Chinese versions of our text. At first sight they are problematic. The Mahāsāṅghika account is the least specific saying only "Le Buddha voyageait au pays de Kosala." Both the Mahīśāsaka and Dharmaguptaka accounts are a little more helpful. The first says that the Buddha wandering in Kośala "parvint au village de

---

[13] Their formal relationship is not unambiguously established. Todeyya, the regular Skt. of which is Taudeya (v.l. Todeya) appears to be derived from Tudi, Skt. Tūdī, itself according to Pāṇini a place name (see, Lévi, Karmav. 21 n. 3). Toyikā, on the other hand, appears at first sight to be derived from Toya, and Tib. chu maṅs seems to support such a derivation. BHSD 257, however, has already put a question mark on this. If we take into account BHSG 2.32 ("As regularly with Pkt. and sporadically in Pāli, we find (rarely) y for an intervocalic stop: tāyin, regularly for Pāli tādin, etc."; cf. W. Geiger Pali Literature and Language, trans. B. Ghosh (Calcutta: 1943) 81, § 36) and assume the same substitution here, it may not be impossible to derive toyikā (as well as taudeya, todeya) from tūdī. The change in suffix is perhaps also accounted for by BHSG 2.32 and 33, Geiger § 36. From the other side, if as BHSG 2.32 suggests for BHS, the substitution may also go in reverse for Pali, perhaps Todeyya here is the Pālization of Skt. toyikā (again with change of suffix).

brahmanes Tou-i (都夷 ..."; in the second, with the same preamble, the city is called Tou-tseu (都子). In both cases Bareau translates these 'names'; the first as "Ville-blessé", which he restores as Nagaraviddha, or as "Ville de même espèce", restored to Nagaravidhā, all followed by a question mark; the second as "Ville-enfant" restored to "Nagaraputra?". He then goes on to say: "Nagaraviddha, Nagaravidhā et Nagaraputra doivent être identifiés à Nagarabindu/Nagaravinda qui était un village de brahmanes situé entre Śrāvastī, capitale du Kosala, et Vārāṇasī (p. 261). If Tou-i/Tou-tseu can be identified with Nagarabindu/ Nagaravinda, then their location appears to be in agreement with that of Todeyya as given by DhAiii 250. The problem here is that MSVi 66 in the uddāna heading the section in which our Sanskrit text is found gives unmistakable proof that Nagarabindu and Toyikā are two distinct and separate places. The second half of the itinerary given by the uddāna reads:

> peyā toyikā ca śrāvastī anavataptaḥ /
> nagarabinduś ca vaiśālī bhavati paścima //

which seems to indicate not only that Toyikā and Nagarabindu were different places but also that the latter lay on a route between Śrāvastī and Vaiśālī. This is enough to indicate that something is not quite right here. What that something is, the present writer -- because of his linguistic poverty -- can only imperfectly suggest.

The suggestion is this: it seems possible that in the case of Tou-i and Tou-tseu, what Bareau took for translations are in fact transliterations; that rather than restore through translation as Nagaraviddha, etc., they should be taken as phonetic representations of an Indian original and, without knowing the exact phonetic value of the characters, that this original was Toyikā or some form of it. This suggestion, happily, is not without some further support.

Fa-Hsien in the records of his travels makes a number of references to Kāśyapa Buddha, the most important of which is this: "Fifty li to the west of the city [Śrāvastī] we arrive at a town called To-wai; this was the birthplace of Kāśyapa Buddha. Towers [=stūpas] are erected on the spot where he had an interview with his father and also where he entered Nirvāṇa. A great tower [stūpa] has also been erected over the relics of the entire body of Kāśyapa Tathagata."[14] Legge[15] transcribes the name as Too-wei, and both he and Beal, following Cunningham,[16] identify this "town" with Tandwā, a village nine miles west of the present site known as Saheṭh-Maheṭh.

---

[14] Beal, Buddhist Records, xlviii.

[15] J. Legge, A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms (Oxford:1886) 63.

[16] Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, Vol.1 (Simla: 1871) 348-50; vol. 11 (Calcutta: 1880) 70-78.

This identification is repeated by Giles [17] who translates the passage simply "Fifty li to the west of the city there is a town named Tadwa,..." and by Li Yung-hsi.[18] More helpful for our purposes, and anticipatory to our own observations are Watters' observations: "Fa-hsien, who places Kāśyapa Buddha's natal city 50 li to the west of Śrāvastī, calls the city Tu-wei (都維). These characters probably represent a sound like Topi, and the city is perhaps that called Tu-yi [都夷] in a Vinaya treatise [T.1421, the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya].[19] It seems that all that is required to confirm the correctness of Watters' suggestion is reference to our Sanskrit text. Once given a tradition which places the remains of Kāśyapa not at Benares where the bulk of our sources place them (a fact noted by both Legge and Watters), but at a place called Toyikā, then all these Chinese "renderings" become transparent, both that of Fa-hsien and those of the Vinaya accounts. The identification of a Sanskrit version of the latter (i.e. MSVi 73ff) makes it almost certain that Tou-i and Tou-tseu were attempts to render

---

17 The Travels of Fa-hsien (London: 1923) 36.

18 A Record of the Buddhist Countries (Peking: 1957) 49.

19 T. Watters, On Yuan Chwang's Travels to India, Vol. 1 (London: 1904) 400.

the name Toyikā. It is perhaps equally certain, since there is an old literary tradition which places the remains of Kāśyapa at a place called Toyikā near Śrāvastī, that when Fa-hsien speaks of a stūpa of the remains of Kāśyapa at a place near Śrāvstī and calls that place To-wai, he is attempting to render some form of that same name. All three cases appear to be transliterations, not translations. The final suggestion is this: Sanskrit Toyikā, Pali Todeyya, Tibetan chu maṅs, Chinese Tou-i, Tou-tseu, To-wei all are names (or the name) for a settlement near Śrāvastī, probably the present day Tandwā,[20] with which an old pre-classical form of the tradition associated the remains of Kāśyapa Buddha. That both Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang place the remains here is worthy of note. It indicates that in spite of the persistent and wide-spread literary tradition to the contrary, the association of Kāśyapa and

---

[20] W. Vost in an article entitled "Setavyā, or To-wai" JRAS, 1903, pp. 513-16, apparently with no knowledge of Cunningham's proposed identification, identified To-wai with Setavyā. But his identification is based on such slender evidence, that it can be safely ignored.

Toyikā persisted at least locally down to their respective times.[21]

---

[21] Hsüan-tsang in referring to the stūpa of the remains of Kāśyapa does not actually name the town in which it is located: "To the north-west of the capital [Śrāvastī] 16 li or so [Watters: "Above 60 li"] there is an old town. In the Bhadra-Kalpa when men lived to 20,000 years, this was the town in which Kāśyapa Buddha was born. To the south of the town there is a stūpa. This is the place where he first met his father after arriving at enlightenment. To the north of the town is a stūpa which contains relics of the entire body of Kāśyapa Buddha. Both these were built by Aśoka Raja (Beal ii 13; Watters i 400)." There is one point of detail both here and in Fa-hsien worthy of further note. Beal (ii 13 n. 27) says the expression "the entire body" in the passage just quoted from Hsüan-tsang is the same expression as that used by Fa-hsien in referring to the remains of the Bhikṣu Kāśyapa inside the Gurupâdaka Mt. The expression here is 全身 . Interestingly enough it is this same expression plus 全利 that Fa-hsien uses in referring to the remains of the Buddha Kāśyapa at To-wai. This verbal parallelism does not appear to be accidental. As we have seen above (n.11) the account of the remains of the Bhikṣu Kāśyapa found at Divy. 61 uses the expression avikopitam asthisaṃghātaṃ in referring to his remains, and it is this same expression which our Sanskrit text uses when referring to the remains of the Buddha Kāśyapa (see n. 7 to trans. of the Skt. text). The parallel use of such an expression (which in the Sanskrit sources at least is not common) in both the Sanskrit and Chinese documents which, in turn, are parallel to one another, further indicates the probability that both sets of documents are repeating the same traditions. It may further indicate that Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang were either familiar with some version of these Sanskrit accounts, or that some version of these stories was current at the time at the two places they respectively visited.

The discrepancy on the placement of To-wai between Fa-hsien (50 li to the west of Śrāvastī) and Hsüan-tsang (above 60 li to the northwest of Śrāvastī) is not too serious; nor is the discrepancy between these two and DhAiii 250 (on some route between Śrāvastī and Benares). The latter is problematic only if we assume that Buddhas always travelled in a straight line; a fact not yet firmly established. That a route going from Śrāvastī to Benares would first go west is far from impossible, especially if only the eventual destination was Benares.

Having come this far, the material presented above requires some systemization and allows of certain conclusions. Vogel has already indicated a number of things concerning the place of the former Buddhas, and especially Kāśyapa, in early Indian Buddhism. He has for instance pointed out that the names of the former Buddhas "agree in all the schools, a circumstance pointing to an early date of this development";[22] and, after a study of the material, that "the evidence of the ancient monuments supplemented by the narratives of the Chinese pilgrims testifies the reverence in which the Indian Buddhists held the past Buddhas and in particular Kāśyapa".[23] Our study of even the limited literary sources cited above bears him out and, in reference to the cult of Kāśyapa, is able to furnish a few additional observations.

Our first observation, perhaps an obvious one, is that the literary material studied indicates unmistakably an evolution in the tradition concerning the remains of Kāśyapa. The earliest form of the tradition -- represented by the text preserved at MSVi 73 ff, Divy 76 ff and 465 ff, and 'dul ba, PTT 41. 179-3-6 ff -- places the avikopito 'sthisaṃghāta, the undisturbed mass of relics of Kāśyapa in the ground at a spot (pradeśa) near a place called Toyikā. It

---

[22] J. Ph. Vogel, "The Past Buddhas and Kāśyapa in Indian Art and Epigraphy," Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller (Leipzig: 1954) 808.

[23] Ibid., 815.

also records the establishment of a festival (maha) at that spot by "believing brāhmaṇas and householders." A second stage in the development of the tradition -- represented by the Mahāsāṅghika, Mahīśāsaka, and Dharmaguptaka Vinaya accounts preserved in Chinese, and by the account in DhA iii 250 ff -- again places the relics of Kāśyapa at Toyikā (=Tou-i, Tou-tseu, Todeyya), but now they are contained in a stūpa which is in the ground (not specifically stated in DhA., and here called a cetiya) and which is 'magically' made to to appear (not specifically stated in Dharmaguptaka). It also records the construction at that spot (after the 'magically' raised stūpa disappears) of a stūpa by the Buddha himself, or by the Buddha and monks, laymen, etc. (in DhA the stone cetiya which remains on the spot simply appears), the Mahīśāsaka saying "Ce fut le premier stūpa élevé alors sur le territoire du Jambudvīpa." Another and third stage of the tradition -- represented by MSV i 191, 195, 200; ii 77 ff; iv 190 ff = Divy. 22 ff; Av. ii 76; 124-25; DhA iii 29; iv 64, 189, etc. -- places the remains of Kāśyapa in Benares in a stūpa built by the Rāja Kṛki (the role of Kṛki in the Pāli sources is not yet exactly determined). As we have noted above (p. 47) the tradition recorded by Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang is that of the second stage of development and not, as we might expect of the third. It is the tradition in its earliest form which is undoubtedly the most interesting.

The 'canonical' position on the treatment to be accorded to the remains of a Buddha is well known from the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta

in both its Pāli and Sanskrit versions, and one of the central elements of that treatment is the building of a stūpa over such remains. It is therefore of more than passing interest to come across the text of MSVi 73 which appears to know nothing of this procedure, and that may in fact indicate that at least in this case the remains of a Buddha were simply buried in the ground without any visible marker. At the very least it undeniably indicates that there was at least one tradition current which knew of the remains of a Buddha existing without any connection with a stūpa. The implications of this situation may be expressed in one or two ways; either 1): the account preserved in MSVi 73 is earlier than the stūpa passages in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta and its parallel texts; this, in turn, would indicate that the stūpa tradition of Mahāparinibbāna-sutta, etc., does not represent the oldest tradition on the treatment of the remains of a Buddha and, as a consequence, the stūpa tradition cannot have formed a part of the earliest Buddhist traditions.[24]

---

[24] This, of course, is not a new position; it has been suggested before by a number of early scholars (most of whom depended primarily on the Pāli sources), but always on rather subjective or speculative grounds. The case of MSVi 73 ff. is perhaps the first in which there is any hard literary evidence. Interpreted in this way, the case of MSVi 73 ff does not lend any support to views such as that recently expressed by D. L. Snellgrove ("Śākyamuni's Final Nirvana" BSOAS 36 (1973) 409-11) with which the present writer is in sympathy.

Or 2): There existed two traditions on the way in which the remains of a Buddha are to be treated; in one a stūpa is erected over the remains; in the other there is no reference to a stūpa. The former tradition in the course of the development of the larger structure of which it was (and is) a part, presumably won out over the latter and this second tradition almost entirely died out; it is now preserved only (perhaps) in MSVi 73 ff. It is not possible given the present state of our knowledge to unhesitantly choose one or the other alternative. All that can be said is that there is at least one tradition -- either earlier or contemporaneous with the stūpa tradition -- which knew of the remains of a Buddha being preserved apart from any stūpa. [25]

There is one other related point which, fortunately, allows for a more definite statement. According to the earliest account of the remains of the Buddha Kāśyapa, that is MSVi 73 ff, the cult of this Buddha was organized around a spot (pradeśa) at which the Buddha Śākyamuni is said to have raised the undisturbed mass of relics of this past Buddha, and under the ground of which those same relics presumably were presumed to remain. The cult activity consisted in

---

[25] It should be pointed out that we have consciously and carefully avoided using the word 'history'. We are not dealing here with "history", but with the history of a tradition. From this point of view it matters not at all that the remains of the Buddha here referred to are those of a past Buddha. From the point of view of the tradition, all Buddhas are on the same footing. They are all equally "real". Aśoka, when he went to Nigalisagar, did not render homage to an "unhistorical" Buddha. And, conversely, the stūpas, images, etc. of the Buddhas Kāśyapa and Kanakamuni found throughout India are as "historical" as those of Śākyamuni.

circumambulating that spot, placing there balls of (fragrant) earth, scattering flowers there, etc.. This same early account knows of a festival (<u>maha</u>) established there, the nature of which we know nothing about.[26] It knows nothing about a stūpa erected on or near this spot, and a stūpa plays no part in the ritual activity described by this earliest of accounts.

That the tradition concerning this sacred spot near Toyikā did not for long remain unaware of a stūpa erected there is adequately demonstrated by the accounts preserved in the Chinese Vinayas, and, assuming the identity of Toyikā with To-wei, the presence of a stūpa there is confirmed by the accounts of Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang. The latter in ascribing the construction of the stūpa to Aśoka gives a possible date for its appearance and this date is perhaps supported by a number of inscribed fragments found by Cunningham near the ruined 'great stūpa' at Tandwā. He says of these: "[Fragments] Nos. 5,6,7, and 8, are other inscribed fragments, all of which I have preserved for the purpose of showing that the great stūpa of Tandwā must have been as early as the time of Aśoka, as the characters on these fragments are the same as those of his inscriptions." [27] We know from

---

[26] It is worthy of note that the reference to the Stūpa of Kāśyapa at <u>Avadānaśataka</u> ii 76.14 refers to <u>stūpamaha</u> being celebrated: <u>tasya rājñā kṛkiṇā śarīre śarīrapūjām kṛtvā samantayojanaś catūratnamaya stūpaḥ pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ krośam uccatvena / tatra ca stūpamahe vartamāne dyūtakareṇa dīnāradvayaṃ tasmin stūpe yaṣṭyāṃ samāropitam</u>. There is also reference to <u>mahas</u> being celebrated as a part of the enshrining in stūpas of the relics of Śākyamuni; see E. Waldschmidt, <u>Das Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra</u>, T. III (Berlin: 1951) 446; cf. <u>Jātaka</u> iv 228 on <u>bodhi-maha</u>.

[27] Cunningham, <u>Annual Report</u>, XI, 74; Vogel, <u>Asiatica</u>, 813.

his own testimony that Aśoka was responsible for doubling in size a stūpa of the Buddha Kanakamuni which apparently predated him.[28] It is therefore not improbable that he might also have been involved in the construction of a stūpa of the Buddha Kāśyapa. Whether this was the original construction or -- as with the Kanakamuni stūpa -- additional construction, is impossible to say. However, it should be noted that Hsüan-tsang, while attributing the construction of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa to Aśoka, does not mention having seen there an 'Aśokan pillar'; and, while recording the presence of an 'Aśokan pillar' at the site of the Kanakamuni stupa, he does not explicitly ascribe the construction of this stūpa to Aśoka, only the pillar.

Finally, again assuming, as it appears we must, that our Sanskrit version represents an old -- probably the earliest -- account of the remains of Kāśyapa, we must take note of the difference between it and the later versions in the role assigned respectively to monks and to the laity in the ritual activity which surrounds these remains. In our Sanskrit version it is for the 'seeing' of the monks that the 'mass of relics' is raised up, but the only exhortation directed towards them is the somewhat curious: udgṛhṇīta bhikṣavo nimittaṃ antardhāsyatīti (dge sloṅ dag rtags zuṅ śig / nub bar 'gyur ro źes pa). On the other hand the text persistently specifies that the ritual acts directed towards the pradeśa were undertaken by upāsakas, by prāṇis,

[28] See J. Bloch, Les inscriptions d'Aśoka (Paris: 1950) 158; Watters ii 5-7; Vogel, Asiatica, 813.

and that the festival was celebrated Śrāddhair brāhmaṇagṛhapatibhis. The Bhikṣus appear to have no part in all of this (we know, however, from MSV ii 143 f. that monks at least attended the festival). In the text represented by the Chinese versions the situation is very different. There the laity, though usually present, are definitely of a secondary importance. It is the monks who ask for and get authorization to render homage to the stūpa, to offer flowers and perfumes, etc. in the Mahāsāṅgika account; who construct the stūpa with "boules de boue" in the Mahīśāsaka, and who -- although here along with the laity -- do likewise in the Dharmaguptaka account (see Bareau, 259-62). The difference in orientation is unmistakable. In the case of the first two Vinaya accounts this change in orientation is at least partially accounted for by the fact the tradition of the remains of Kāśyapa is here used as an introduction to the general rules of these Vinaya on the construction and cult of the stūpa. But such a usage of this tradition is in itself significant, implying, perhaps, that the version of the tradition available to the compilers of these two Vinayas was already such as to serve as an authority for a set of rules governing the behaviour of monks. Unfortunately the Pāli version is of little help on this point. In it, it is to remove the doubts of the Bhikkhus that the golden cetiya is made to appear, but it is to the Brāhmaṇa that the exhortation to do pūjā of those pūjāraha is addressed (if, as Burlingame's rendering implies, mahājana=mahābhikkhusaṃgha (see note 10 to trans.). Then the bhikkhus, far from being the doers of pūjā, are the object

of it). In its final paragraph, the Pāli account says simply that a mahanto samāgamo worshipped the cetiya for seven days. The composition of this samāgama is not specified, so again the exact position of the Pāli account on this point remains uncertain.

We come then anupūrvaśas to the point from which we departed: Bareau's remarks on the account of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa to the effect that "Cependant, certains indices laissent à penser que l'un au moins des récits, celui qui concerne le stūpa du Buddha Kāśyapa, peut remonter, dans sa version primitive, à une époque antérieure au règne d'Aśoka." Now it is clear from the data presented above that the argument he presented in support of this remark (see above p. 3) will not stand up, even, perhaps, if radically altered in light of our "new" material. But while the argument falls down, the remark itself fares better. Everything about the account preserved in MSVi 73 ff points to its being a very old tradition: its placement at a practically unknown village in Kośala; its ignorance of a stūpa containing the relics of Kāśyapa or of any association of the remains of the latter with a king of Benares by the name of Kṛki; the uniqueness of its introductory passage and the non-standard elements of its vocabulary -- padāvihāra, mālāvihāra, asthisaṃghāta, etc. -- and, finally, the fact that some version of it is known by at least five important schools. Whether or not we accept Hsüan-tsang's ascription of the construction of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa to Aśoka (and the archaeological evidence which may support it), the fact

remains that the Stūpa cult in general, as well as some form of it in connection with the past Buddhas, was well established by his time. This fact, coupled with the fact that the account of MSVi 73 ff knows nothing of a Stūpa cult, is by itself perhaps sufficient to indicate that this account is pre-Aśokan. If we go further and assume that the fact that MSVi 73 ff knows of the remains of a Buddha which are preserved apart from any stūpa indicates that it is earlier than the stūpa passages of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra (themselves quite old judging from their occurrence in all versions), and its parallel stūpa texts, then we must accord to the account now found at MSVi 73 ff a very early date, a date the lower limit of which remains unfortunately vague.

Addendum

Prof. de Jong was kind enough to send me six pages of detailed notes and corrections to this part of the 'thesis'. Unfortunately I did not have time to incorporate them into the paper. Some of them however, were too important to leave unnoted and I therefore chose to give them in the form of an addendum.

p. 5, line 17: For 'Just So' = evam, read simply 'Yes'.

p. 7, line 14: '...through the thinking of the Blessed One, are aware of that thought.' = bhagavataś cetaśā cittam ājānanti; read instead: 'They understand the thought of the Blessed One through reflection.' Also p. 8, line 18: '...and having known the thought through reflection of that lay disciple...' which is ambiguous, read instead: '...having known the thought of that lay disciple through reflection...'. So also at p. 9, line 6, etc.

p. 7, line 19: 'Thereupon the undisturbed mass of relics of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa by him were raised up.' In comparing the different versions of the text I overlooked here an important variant. G here reads tatas tena kāśyapasya samyaksaṃbuddhasyāvikopitaḥ śarīrasaṃghāta ucchrāpitaḥ; but D1, D2 and T all have tatas taiḥ (= de nas de rnams kyis); i.e., the relics were raised by the nāgas. This variation is obviously bound up with the textual difficulties discussed in note 11 and the whole situation there must be rethought.

p. 8, line 5: if the text of G is correct, then sthapati refers only to Purāṇa

p. 8, line 7: 'by whatever [were there] former roots of good'; read instead: 'by some former...'.

p. 8, line 17: for 'contentment' read 'absence of regret'.

p. 9, line 3: for 'so far' read 'in the first place' or 'to begin with'.

p. 9, line 15: for 'plucked' read 'loose'.

p. 10, line 1 and n. 24: Prof. de Jong thinks that in spite of T, Lévi (BSOAS 8 (1936) 619-22 and Karmav. 63 n. 2) is right in supposing that mālāvihāra refers to some kind of "building". This remains problematic.

p. 19, note 28: This note must be rewritten to take into account the 'parallel' passage in a fragment of an unidentified text published by H. Luders in Weitere Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie von Ostturkestan, BSB Phil.-hist. kl. 1930, 482-538.

p. 20, note 31: I myself discovered after this note was written that this verse is quoted--with no indication of source: uktaṃ ca... in Prajñākaramatikṛtā Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā (Poussin Ed.) 424.10. It reads: śamacittaprasādena.

p. 22, note 6: In reference to the Chinese version of MSV, Prof. de Jong wrote to me that; "The Chinese tr. of MSV contains the account of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa; cf. Taishō, vol. XXIV, 53 a11-c15. Toyikā is transliterated: Tu-i-chia which corresponds exactly to Toyikā.

p. 36, line 24 and note 9: 'having created in the sky, like a gold mountain another gold cetiya.' I have misunderstood the text here; read: 'like another gold mountain'; and ignore the remarks I made on the basis of my mis-translation.

Appendix

We give here a translation with notes of one of the many accounts of the Stūpa of Kāśyapa at Vārāṇasī. It clearly illustrates the 'classical' tradition concerning the remains of this Buddha and thus also clearly underlines the difference between this 'classical' tradition and MSV i 73 ff. It also contains valuable information on two distinct ways in which the upkeep and maintanence of a stūpa was financially supported. This information establishes the fact that the machinations of governmental finance have changed little in 2000 years.

A bhūtapūrvam account from

the (Śroṇa-)Koṭīkarṇāvadāna [1]

MSV iv 190.14-193.16; Divy (CN) 22.4-24.1;(Vaidya)13.17-14.23; 'dul ba, PTT 41, 102-3-1 to 5-4.

The Blessed One said: formerly, Bhikṣus, in the city of Vārāṇasī a Tathāgata, Arhat Samyaksaṃbuddha, a Blessed One, a Teacher named Kāśyapa appeared in the world. [2] Also at that time in Vārāṇasī there was a married couple. By both of them the going for refuge and the rules of training [3] were taken up in the presence of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa. When the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa, having done the whole duty of a Buddha, [4] was parinirvāṇed [5] in the sphere of Nirvāṇa not having any remainder, a caitya for him made from the four precious things [and] a yojana in circumference [and] a half a yojana in height was caused to be made by the Rāja Kṛkin. [6] By him there for repairing the broken and dilapidated [7] which toll-revenues [8] came in at the Eastern gate of the city, they were made over to that stūpa. When the Rāja Kṛkin died a son of his named Sujāta (,he) was established in Kingship. [9] [Now] by his ministers very little toll-revenue was handed over. [10]

The Rāja [Sujāta] asked: [11] 'What is the reason very little toll-revenue is handed over to us by you gentlemen? [12] What toll-revenues in our territory are coming in?'

They replied: 'O Deva, [13] from where can toll-revenues come in? Which, O Deva, are the toll-revenues at the eastern gate, they by the former Rāja were designated for repairing the broken and dilapidated on that stūpa. If the Deva authorizes [14] it we [will] cut off those toll-revenues.'

He replied: 'Gentlemen, what by my father was done, just that was done by Brahma.' [15]

They [the ministers] reflected: if the Deva (does not) authorize it, we thus will act such that those toll-revenues themselves will not come in. Having chained [it], by them that gate was kept shut. The toll-revenues no longer came in; [16] and on that stūpa cracks appeared, [17] [yet] that married couple, having grown old, continued attending to that stūpa.

[At that time] from the northern country a caravan leader with his goods arrived at Vārāṇasī. By him that stūpa with cracks and breaks having appeared was seen. [18] He, having seen it, asked: "Good Woman, Good Sir, of whom is this a stūpa?"

They replied: "Of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa."

[He asked:] "By whom was it caused to be constructed?'

[They replied:] "By the Rāja Kṛkin."

[He asked:] "Was nothing designated by that Rāja for repairing the broken and dilapidated on this stūpa?"

They replied: [19] [Yes, something] was designated: which at the Eastern gate of the city were the toll-revenues, they were given for repairing the broken and dilapidated on this stūpa. [But]

the Rāja Kṛkin died [and] a son of his named Sujāta (,he) was established in kingship. [20] Then those toll-revenues were cut-off.[21] Then cracks and breaks appeared on this stūpa.

[Now] an ear-ornament of jewels was fastened on the ear of that [caravan leader]. By him, having unfastened from [his] ear the ear-ornament of jewels, [22] it was given to them [and he said:] "Good Woman, Good Sir, with this ear-ornament of jewels you must do the repairing of the broken and dilapidated on this stūpa [23] until I, having dispatched [my] goods, return. Thence after that I will give even more [towards the project]."

By them, having sold that [ornament], the repairing of the broken and dilapidated [24] on this stūpa was done. Some [of the money from the sale of the ornament] was left over. [25] Then at a later time he, the caravan leader, having dispatched [his] goods, returned. [26] That stūpa [now] having a lovely appearance was seen by him, [27] and, having seen [it], he was more and more filled with faith. [28] He, having generated faith, asked: [29] "Good Woman, Good Sir, I hope by you no debt was incurred [because of this work]?" [30]

They replied: "My son, not by us was any debt [incurred]; rather, part [of that money] remains left over."

By him having generated faith, having given there what remained and more, having done great pūjā and reverence, [31] a vow was made: "May I, through this root of good, be born in a rich family having great wealth, having great property; and may I be one meeting

with dharmas of such a sort; just such a sort of teacher may I please, not displease!" [32]

[The Buddha said:] O Bhikṣus what do you think? Who was that caravan leader, this was just that Śroṇa-Koṭīkarṇa . Since by this one, after having done acts of worship at the stūpa of the Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa, a vow was made, through the ripening of that action he was born in a rich family having great wealth, having great property. [33] Having gone forth into my teaching, from the abandoning of all impurities, Arhatship was directly realized. I, being equal in strength with this Samyaksaṃbuddha Kāśyapa, equal in inherent power, equal in burden, [34] equal in having obtained universiality, [35] the teacher, am pleased, not displeased. [36] For [37] bhikṣus, of wholly black acts is a wholly black ripening; of wholly white acts is a wholly white ripening, of mixed [acts] is a mixed [ripening]. Therefore here, bhikṣus, having left behind wholly black acts and mixed [acts], just in white acts is earnest effort to be made. Thus of you, O bhikṣus, it is to be learned. [38]

Notes

1 On this Avadāna see E. Waldschmidt, "Zur Śroṇakoṭikarṇa-Legende," Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse 6 (1952) 129-151.

2 G: bhūtapūrvaṃ bhikṣavo vārāṇasyāṃ nagaryāṃ Kāśyapo nāma tathāgato 'rhan, etc.; D: bhūtāpūrvaṃ yāvat Kāśyapo nāma tathāgato 'rhan, etc.; T: dge sloṅ dag sṅon byuṅ ba skye dgu rnams kyi tshe lo ñi khri thub pa na bā rā ṇa sī'i groṅ khyer du ston pa 'od sruṅ źes bya ba de bźin gśegs pa dgra bcom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas śes bya ba nas 'jig rten du sgra rnam par grags pa źes bya ba'i bar 'jig rten du byuṅ ṅo / For T. compare -- at least in part -- Avadānaśataka ii 76.10: bhūtapūrvaṃ bhikṣavo 'tīte 'dhvany asminn eva bhadrake kalpe viṃśativarṣasahasrāyuṣi prajāyāṃ kāśyapo nāma samyaksaṃbuddho loke udapādi, etc.

3 śaraṇagamanaśikṣāpada; skyabs su 'gro ba daṅ slab pa'i gźi rnams [=bslab pa'i gźi rnams, KP 134]; i.e. They became upāsakas; See É. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien (Louvain: 1958) 76-78.

4 G, D: yadā Kāśyapaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhaḥ sakalaṃ buddhakāryaṃ Kṛtvā; T:gaṅ gi tshe yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas kyi mdzad pa mtha' dag mdzad nas. On the lists of Buddha - [or Tathāgata-] Kāryas see Divy. (CN) 150.15.; Daśabhūmika Sūtra (Vaidya) 10.3-7; 61.9-11; Lamotte, La Concentration de la Marche Héroïque (Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra) [MCB XIII] (Bruxelles: 1965) 122-23;

140; 223-24; 263; M. Hofinger, Le Congrès du lac anavatapta (Louvain, 1954) 7-8; 175-77.

5 parinirvṛta-; we give the term thus following the example of Lamotte (L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Louvain: 1962) 367: "Que le Tathāgata existe encore actuellement ou qu'il soit déjà parinirvāné") in an attempt to retain the verbal nature of the original.

6 G: rājñā Kṛkiṇā caturatnamayaṃ caityaṃ kāritaṃ samantād yojanam ardhayojanam uccatvena; T: de'i mchod rten rin po che sna bźi las kho ra khor yug du dpag tshad gaṅ tsam la 'phaṅ du dpag tshad phyed ba źig byed du bcug nas; D. omits ardhayojanam but this is clearly an oversight and the reading suggested by Bailey on the basis of the Tib (D.R. Shackleton Bailey "Notes on the Divyāvadāna" JRAS (1950) 173) is confirmed by G.

7 G: khaṇḍasphuṭapratisaṃskaraṇāya (ye); Ms. (Dutt 191 n.1): khaṇḍariṭṭapratisaṃskaranīye D=G; T: źig ciṅ gogs pa slar bcos pa'i phyir; Pali: khaṇḍaphullaṃ paṭisankharoti (see PTSD 231[2] for occurrences). This compound occurs six times in our text and Edgerton BHSD 371) has already noted a variation in form: Divy. (CN) 22.19 and 23.1 have khaṇḍasphuṭapratisaṃskārakaraṇāya, while Divy. 22.11 and 23.3 have °-pratisaṃskaraṇāya. He takes the latter forms as haplographies for the former, and would read the former throughout. G. offers little help here, the ms. (according to Dutt's critical apparatus) presenting a number of forms. Dutt has consistently printed

°-pratisamskaranāya but for G 191.12 he gives a ms. reading: khandachutapratisamskaranīye; for G 192.5: chuttpratisamskāri-°; for G 192.7 he gives no. v.l. All these occurrences are datives. The compound also occurs as an acc. and a nom.; for the first (G 192.12) printed as °-pratisamskāram kurutam, the ms. reads catitasphutitakāni kurvamseti; for the second (G 192.14) printed khandasphutapratisamskārah krtah, the ms. has apparently just khandaphuta. In both instances Dutt has -- without giving the source -- printed the reading of Divy. The T, in order of occurence has: mchod rten źig ciṅ gogs pa slar bcos pa'i rgyur; mchod rten de źig pa daṅ gogs pa slar bcos pa'i phyir; mchod rten de źig pa daṅ gogs pa [slar] bcos pa'i phyir; mchod rten 'di źig ciṅ gogs pa rnams chos śib; mchod rten de źig pa daṅ gogs pa slar bcos te.

cf. S. Lévi, Mahākarmavibhaṅga et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Paris: 1932) 34.4: tathā stūpacaityavihārānām śīrṇānām pratisamskaranam [v.l. pratisamskārakaranam.] Ata evoktam.

akālamrtyur na bhavet tasya
yo bhagnaśīrṇam pratisamskaroti

(This occurs as one of a list of karma dīrghāyuhsamvartanīyam). The Tib. (p. 185.3) has: de bźin du mchod rten daṅ gtsug lag khaṅ źig pa dag bcos legs byas pa ste. mdo de ñid las.

źig ciṅ ral pa sus bcos pa.
de la ye 'gag bdud mi 'gyur.

8 karapratyāya; dpya.

9 G: °-tasya putraḥ sujāto nāmnā svarājye pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ, but Ms. (Dutt 191 n.3) has: svajāto nāmnā rājye; D: tasya putraḥ sujāto nāmnā sa rājye pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ; T: de'i bu legs skyes śes bya ba de rgyal srid la bźag ba. Dutt's emendation is a little hard to understand; read: tasya putraḥ sujāto nāmnā (sa) rājye pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ.

The details on the family of Kṛki, his successor, etc., are confused; see Hofinger, Le congrès 225 & ns. 1,3; 241 & 2; 262.

10 upanāmitāḥ; bul lo; the change in verb from uttiṣṭhante implying that the revenue was still coming in, but the ministers were holding on to it.

11 G: Rājā pṛcchati; D: so 'mātyān āmantrayate; T: des blon po rnams la smras pa, supporting D.

12 D: kiṃkāraṇam asmākaṃ bhavadbhiḥ stokakarapratyāyā upanāmitāḥ; T: ci'i phyir khyed kyis ṅa la dpya ñuṅ ṅu źig phul. In G this phrase is bracketed and persumably missing. Note here and in the next question the plural of respect in the 1st pers. pron. cf. BHSG 5.2.

13 On this use of deva cf. J. Filliozat "The Deva-s of Asoka: 'Gods' or 'Divine Majesties'", in Studies in Asokan Inscriptions (Calcutta:1967) 33-55.

14 G: yadi devo 'nujānīte; D: yadi devo 'nujānīyāt te; T: gal te lhas gnaṅ na.

15 G: bhavanto yan mama pitrā kṛtaṃ tad eva brahmakṛtam, Ms. (191 n.6) tad eva kṛtaṃ brahmakṛtam; T: śes ldan ṅa'i yab kyis gaṅ mdzad pa de ni tshaṅs pas byas pa'o / de ni brgya byin gyis byas pa'o / which, as Bailey (JRAS (1950) 173) has pointed out, would give a reading like: yan mama pitrā kṛtaṃ brahmakṛtaṃ tat, śakrakṛtaṃ tat. We have here translated G, the sense being 'what was done by my father was done by Brahma (i.e., it can not be undone).' The reading of D, on the other hand, is considerably different: bhavanto yan mama pitrā kṛtaṃ devakṛtaṃ na tu brahmakṛtaṃ tat (no v.l.): 'Gentlemen, what was done by my father was done by a Deva, but not was that done by Brahma (i.e. it can be undone or changed)'. Which of these two readings we choose depends largely on how we understand what follows in the text. See the following note.

For the term brahmakṛta cf Digha iii 28.11: santi bhaggava eke samaṇabrāhmaṇā issarakuttaṃ brahmakuttaṃ ācariyakaṃ aggaññaṃ paññāpenti.

16 G,D: te saṃlakṣayanti / yadi devo 'nujānīte vayaṃ tathā kariṣyāmo yathā svayam eva te karapratyāyā notthāsyanti / taiḥ sa dvāro baddhvā sthāpitaḥ / na bhūyaḥ karapratyāyā uttiṣṭhante /; T: de dag gis bsams pa / gal te lhas gnaṅ na bdag cag gis ci nas dbya de dag raṅ 'du bar mi 'gyur ba de ltar bya'o /. Initially it should be noted that this 'response' is a mental one, a 'reflection', and not a verbal reply to the king. Second, in our translation we have supplied in parentheses

a negative which -- reading the kings first reply (n.15) with G and T -- seems required. A possible alternative would be to take yadi in the sense of 'whether' (regardless whether'): 'whether the Deva authorizes it, we will do such and such'. Of the passage as a whole, starting with THE ministers reply to the king's first question, and reading with G and T, the general sense appears to be the following: the ministers ask permission to cut-off (samucchindāmaḥ) the toll-revenue; the Rāja says that the toll-revenue, being established by his father, was established by Brahma (i.e. it could not be undone or changed); the ministers then think to themselves that if the Rāja (does not) authorize it (the cutting-off of the toll), then they will act in such a way that the toll, while not being cut-off, will still not come in (notthāsyanti). They then chain the east gate and leave it so, [speculation: forcing the use of the other city gates at which, presumably, a toll was charged, the revenues from which were not committed to the stūpa, but went instead to the king]. Thus while not contravening the grant of the former king, still the revenue was effectively diverted away from the stūpa. It is a clever piece.

The reading of D for the king's response (n.15), besides being based on a much later Ms. tradition and not being supported by the Tib., is in other ways still problematic. If we take it as implying consent (i.e., what was done by my father was done by a deva, but not by Brahma = it can be undone), then the 'reflections' of the ministers which appear to be an attempt to get around a denial of

authorization, and their subsequent actions which put these 'reflections' into practice, seem to be unnecessary. If the king's reply implied consent to the cutting-off of the bestowal to the stūpa, then this would have required a simple appropriation of the revenues collected. But this was not done. Instead of appropirating the revenue collected at the eastern gate, the ministers acted only in such a way as to make it impossible to collect. Both D and G agree on this. The reading of D probably resulted from a false 'correction' by a redactor who missed the subtlety of the original (depending largely on the shift in verb from samucchindāmaḥ to notthāsyanti) and the cleverness of the ministers.

17 G: tasmin stūpe ca sphuṭitakāni prādurbhūtāni; D: tasmin stūpe caṭitakāni prādurbhūtāni; T: mchod rten de yaṅ źig ciṅ gogs par gyur pa daṅ/.

18 G: tenāsau dṛṣṭaḥ stūpaś caṭitasphuṭitakaiḥ prādurbhūtaiḥ; D: tenāsau dṛṣṭaḥ stūpaḥ / caṭitasphuṭitakaḥ prādurbhūtaḥ / [Dutt 192 n.1 cites D wrongly]; T: des mchod rten źig ciṅ gogs par gyur pa de mthoṅ no.

19 G, D: tau kathayataḥ but G Ms: kathayatām; T: de gñis kyis smras pa.

20 G: tasya putraḥ sujāto nāmnā svarājye pratiṣṭhitaḥ; Ms. has svajāto; D: nāma sa rājye; T: de'i sras legs skyes źes bya ba de rgyal srid la bzag nas. cf. n. 9.

21 G. D: tena te karapratyāyāḥ samucchinnāḥ; T: des dbya 'du pa de bcad pas; cf. n. 16 and note especially the Tib. in each case. Tena = des in this case could -- perhaps should -- be translated "by him."

22 G: tena sāvatārya; D: tena sā ratnakarṇikāvatārya; T: des rin po ches spras pa'i rna cha rna ban las dgrol nas. [Bailey, JRAS (1950) 173 from Derge ed.: ...rna cha rna ba las bkrol nas]. We have followed T.

23 G: °-ānayā ratnakarṇikayā asmin stūpe khaṇḍasphuṭapratisaṃskāraṃ kurutam iti, G Ms. caṭitasphuṭitakāṇi kurvaṃseti; D: °-ānayā karṇikayāsmin stūpe khaṇḍasphuṭapratisaṃskāraṃ kurutam iti; rin po che'i rna cha 'dis mchod rten 'di źig ciṅ gogs pa rnams chos śib /

24 G: khaṇḍasphuṭapratisaṃskāraḥ, but Dutt gives Ms. reading as khaṇḍaphuṭa and says that D drops it, which is not the case. D reads khaṇḍasphuṭita-°.

25 G. D: aparaṃ utsarpitam (D v.l. °-taḥ); T: kha gcig ni lhag go.

26 T has a minor addition: de nas dus phyi źig na ded dpon gyis zoṅ pa sgyur nas spogs kyer te 'oṅs so: then at a later time (that) merchant having exchanged (his) goods, carrying away a profit, came (back).

27 G: tena sa dṛṣṭaḥ stūpe 'secanakadarśanaḥ (Ms., °-darśinaḥ); D: tena sa dṛṣṭaḥ stūpo 'secanakadarśanaḥ; T: des mchod rten de lta

bas mi ṅoms pa źig du mthoṅ no: he, not being able to look at it sufficiently, saw that stūpa.

28 G, D: bhūyasyāpi mātrayābhiprasannah; could also be translated: 'was even more favorably disposed'. For T see next note.

29 T joins the last clause of the preceding sentence with this one thus: mthoṅ nas kyaṅ de phyir źiṅ rab tu dga' ba daṅ / dad pa skyes te dris pa: having seen he further was even more glad and, generating faith, he asked:.

30 G: amba tāta mā yuṣmābhiḥ kiñcid uddhārīkṛtam; D omits mā; T: yab yum khyed kyis skyin po cuṅ zad ma byas sam.

31 D reads mahatīm pūjāṃ kṛtvā and in his ed. Dutt prints this reading (without giving a source) while citing (193 n.3) the Ms. reading as mahāntaṃ pūjāsatkāraṃ. T mchod pa daṅ bkur sti cher byas te clearly supports the Ms. reading so that Dutt's emendation must certainly be rejected and the Ms. reading retained.

32 D: evaṃvidham eva śāstāram ārāgayeyam mā virāgayeyam iti; T: ston pa 'di lta bu kho na mñes par byed kyi / mi mñes par mi byed par gyur cig ces. In G we have here one of the not infrequent cases of a bracket which is never closed: ...śāstā-[ram ārāgayeyam mā, etc.

33 T is fuller: smon lam btab pa'i las de'i rnam par smin pas phyug pa daṅ / nor maṅ ba daṅ / loṅs spyod che ba'i rigs daṅ / rin po ches spras pa'i rna cha rna ba la thogs bźin du bcas śin /

34 G: aham anena kāśyapena samyaksaṃbuddhena samabalaḥ samajavaḥ samadhūraḥ; D: °-saṃbuddhena sārdhaṃ samajavaḥ samabalaḥ samadhuraḥ; T follows the sequence of D.

35 G, D: samasāmānyaprāptaḥ; for T Bailey (p. 173), citing the Derge ed., reads mi mñam pa daṅ mñam pa brñes pa, which suggests asamasamaprāptaḥ, although he adds "but CN.'s text may be correct." The Peking ed., on the other hand reads: mi mñam pa dag brñes pa'i (ston pa).

36 G. D: śāstā ārāgitó na virāgita iti, but G Ms. has ārāgyato na virāgyata iti.

37 D omits hi.

38 This concluding passage is a cliché found throughout the Avadāna literature; see L. Feer Avadāna Çataka, Annals du Musée Guiment t.18 (Paris: 1891) 3. The last sentence is bracketed in G.

The Avadāna concludes with a few lines referring to the result of Śroṇa having spoken harsh words to his mother at the beginning of his story (see D. p.5).

PART II: THE PHRASE '*SA PṚTHIVĪPRADEŚAŚ CAITYABHŪTO BHAVET*' IN THE *VAJRACCHEDIKĀ*: NOTES ON THE CULT OF THE BOOK IN MAHĀYĀNA

"...tout, au monde, existe pour
aboutir à un livre..."
—Stéphane Mallarmé—

The Phrase "*sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet*" in the *Vajracchedikā*: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna*

The phrase *sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet* at *Vajracchedikā* (= *Vaj*) 12 & 15c represents neither the sole, nor even, perhaps, the most important occurrence of this curious formula. The *Vaj* occurrences are taken as the point of departure for the present paper because they represent the least fully articulated form of the phrase and its supportive context, and, as a consequence, are most open to misunderstanding if confronted in isolation. Further, by beginning from this point, we are able to illustrate in a more general way the danger of approaching any one piece of Buddhist Sūtra Literature — be it a phrase, a figure of speech, or a whole text — in isolation from its fellows, which generally — as in this case — exhibit an unexpected interlocking of seemingly disparate wholes. The approach followed here is to give the two occurrences of the phrase in the *Vaj*; to look at them and note the difficulties; then to read both behind them and around them in the hope of understanding the intention of the phrase and — if any — its concrete referent. This method requires that we rely heavily on textual citations, and they will usually be given in full in the hope that, since the language of the various passages is similar but not identical, the manner of expression in one passage will illuminate a somewhat different expression in another passage, and vice versa. Our basic source materials are the Sanskrit texts; within the Sanskrit texts, ~~in turn~~, our basic problem is one of how to understand the compound '*caityabhūta*'. As an ancillary aid

to this understanding we have consulted throughout the Tibetan translations of our basic documents. In the process it became apparent that the Tibetan translators had had the same difficulty in rendering the term into Tibetan that modern translators had had in rendering it into modern European languages, proving, I suppose, that if our understanding of these passages is not altogether satisfactory, we can at least be consoled with the idea that we are in good company. Finally, in investigating the occurrence and the context of parallel or partially parallel versions of the phrase in works other than the Vaj, we stumbled upon some significant data which made possible a set of generalizations as to the evolution of basic cult-types in early Mahāyāna.

The first of the two occurrences which constitute our point of departure is Vaj 12 (Müller, 28.10-17; Pargiter 181.13-182.3; Chakravarti, deest; Conze, 37.10-19; Dutt, 150.8-14; Vaidya 79.10-15; Pek. Vol. 21, no. 739, 252-5-5 to 7; Hashimoto and Shimizu, 49.8-9)[1]:

> api tu (khalu punaḥ) Subhūte yasmin pṛthivīpradeśa ito dharmaparyāyād (antaśaś) catuṣpādikām api gāthām (udgṛhya bhāṣyeta vā samprakāśyeta vā sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet) sadevamānuṣāsurasya lokasya [sa phyogs de lha daṅ mi daṅ lha ma yin du bcas pa'i 'jig rten gyi mchod rten du gyur pa yin na], kaḥ punar vādo ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ (sakalasamāptaṃ) dhārayiṣyanti (vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyaś (ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti) parameṇa te Subhūte āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyanti. Tasmiṃś ca Subhūte pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā viharaty anyatarānyataro vā

---

1 Reference is, for convenience, made to all editions of the Skt.: M. Müller, Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series, Vol. I, pt. 1 (Oxford: 1881) 19-46; F. E. Pargiter "Vajracchedikā in the Original Sanskrit" in A. F. R. Hoernle, Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan (Oxford: 1916, repr. Amsterdam: 1970) 176-95; N. P. Cakravarti, "The Gilgit Text of the Vajracchedikā" in G. Tucci, Minor Buddhist Texts, Part I [SOR IX] (Rome: 1956) 182-92; E. Conze, Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā [SOR XIII] (Rome: 1957); N. Dutt, Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. IV (Calcutta: 1959) 141-70; P. L. Vaidya, Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha, Part I [Budd. Skt. Texts, 17] (Darbhanga:

vijñaguru-sthānīyaḥ.[2]

Conze translates this:

"Then again, O Subhuti, that spot of earth where one has taken from this discourse on dharma but one stanza of four lines, taught it or illuminated it, that spot of earth would be like a shrine for the whole world with its Gods, men and Asuras. What then should we say of those who will bear in mind this discourse on dharma in its entirety, who will recite, study, and illuminate it in full detail for others? Most wonderfully blest, Subhuti, will they be. And on that spot of earth, Subhuti, either the

---

1961) 75-89; the text reproduced here is that of Conze's Rome edition. For the Tibetan, I am usually able to refer only to the printed Peking edition: The Tibetan Tripitaka (Peking Edition) ed. D. T. Suzuki (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1956); reference is made to the volume, the number of the work, page in the indicated volume, folio and lines. For the Vaj reference is also made to the Tibetan found in K. Hashimoto and R. Shimizu, Mō-zō-Bon-kan-wa Gappeki, Kongō-Hannya-Haramitsu-Kyō (Tokyo: 1941).

[2] The manuscript tradition produces the following variants (enclosed in the text above by parentheses; the underlining marks the Skt which corresponds to the Tibetan which is placed in brackets immediately following it), almost all of which represent Pargiter's ed. of the "Eastern Turkestan" text: Khalu punaḥ is omitted by Pargiter [the omission of these connective particles is characteristic of his ms.; see Conze's ed. (paragraph numbers) 4,12,14e, 14f, 14g, 14h, 15b(twice), 16b, etc., where variants are marked with a superscribed "P".]; the phrase antaśaś catuṣpādikām api gāthām udgṛhya bhāṣyeta vā samprakāśyeta vā sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet in Pargiter is represented by cātuṣpādā(m a)pi gāthām bhāṣyate: tena saḥ pṛthivīpradeśaḥ caityabhūto bhaviṣyati; this is potentially the most significant variant and will be referred to again below; the phrase vācayiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti is omitted in Pargiter [this is again characteristic of his ms. (cf. Conze, para. num. 14h, 15b, 16a, 16b, etc.)]; finally, sakalasamāptam is omitted in Pargiter. The Skt. version tentatively reconstructed from the Khotanese by S. Konow ("The Vajracchedika in the Old Khotanese Version of Eastern Turkestan" in Hoernle, Manuscript Remains, 255-56) has: yasya pṛthivyāḥ pradeśasya upari saḥ dharmaḥ syāt pūjanīyaḥ sā diśā bhavet saha devasya tathā manuṣyasya pṛthivī-lokena; yasyām diśāyām dharmaḥ syāt caityasya upamā sā diśā prāsādikā bhavet evam ā mānanīyaḥ nūnam śāstā tatra āste tathā sattamaḥ paramaḥ guruḥ.

For the Tibetan we may cite a slightly different version of the phrase found in a fragment of one of the Tibetan translations found at Tun-Huang

Teacher dwells, or a sage representing him."[3]

The second occurrence is at Vaj 15c (Müller, 34.9-12; Pargiter, 186.17-20; Chakravati, 184.20-24; Conze, 44.13-18; Dutt, 156.19-157.3; Vaidya, 82.20-22; Pek. Vol. 21, no. 739, 254-1-1 to 2; Hashimoto and Shimizu, 73.9-10):

> api tu (khalu punaḥ) Subhūte yatra pṛthivīpradeśa idaṃ sūtraṃ prakāśayiṣyate, pūjanīyaḥ sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati sadevamānuṣāsurasya lokasya, vandanīyaḥ (pradakṣiṇīyaś ca sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati) caitya (-bhūtaḥ) sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati [sa phyogs de mchod rten lta bur 'gyur ro][4]

This, in turn, is rendered by Conze as:

> "And again, Subhuti, the spot of earth where this Sutra will be revealed, that spot of earth will be worthy of worship by the whole world with its Gods, men and Asuras, that spot of earth will be worthy of being saluted respectfully, worthy of being honored by circumambulation — like a shrine will be that spot of earth."[5]

---

and reproduced in Poussin's catalogue (L. de La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue of the Tibetain Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library (London: 1962) no. 172, p. 62); Poussin refers to it as "an older translation": sa de'i phyogs lha dañ myi dañ lha ma yin dañ 'jig rten du bcas pha'i mchod rten du gyurd na. Hashimoto and Shimizu has bcas pa'i 'jig rten tu gyur pa yin na instead of bcas pa'i 'jig rten kyi mchod rten du gyur pa yin na. The omission is obviously a scribal error.

[3] Conze, Vaj [SOR XIII] 74; Buddhist Wisdom Books (London: 1958) 50; Selected Sayings from the Perfection of Wisdom (London: 1955) 60.

[4] The manuscript tradition once again produces a few important variants (again enclosed above in parentheses): The Gilgit ms. (Chakravati and Dutt) has, instead of the phrase ca sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati, simply pradakṣiṇīkaraṇīyaś; and perhaps more significantly, Pargiter's ms., rather than reading caityabhūta, reads instead caitya. Konow's reconstruction (ibid 263) has: yatra tam dharmam prakāśayanti pūjanīyā sā diśā bhavet saha devasya manuṣyasya pṛthivī-lokena vandanīyā dakṣiṇena vanditum caritavyā caityasya yathā tasyāḥ diśāyāḥ pūjā kartavyā.

[5] Conze, Vaj [SOR XIII] 80; Buddhist Wisdom Books, 56.

For our part, our initial step must be to separate out of these two similar passages the phrase which Conze translates 'that spot of earth will be like a shrine' (sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet). Conze's rendering, like any other alternative rendering of the phrase, turns on the "grammar" of the compound caityabhūta, which, in turn, turns somewhat on the context in which it occurs. The former, the "grammar" of the compound, is inconsiderately ambiguous. Compounds which have as their final member the participle '-bhūta' are classified by modern grammarians as tatpuruṣas, but are also further distinguished as a special case within that group. Renou says: "Le cas de °bhuta est à part: le mot fournit en fin de comp. l'équivalent de la copule libre dans la phrase nominale et souligne le prédicat; les ex. sont encore très rares Up(aniṣada), S(ūtras) . . . ; à partir, semble-t-il, de Kālid(āsa) se développe la nuance 'qui ressemble à' sama ou upamāne des lexx. . . . Dès l'épopée et les inscr. littéraires, et plus librement en bouddh., se constitute ainsi une finale °bhūta- explétive: bhājanābhūtā bhavanti Div. 'ils deviennent des vases', à l'occasion jointe à un verbal en ta- EpInd. VIII 46."[6] The "grammar" of the compound, then, allows a number of possible options in translating caityabhūto bhavati: either, 'it becomes a caitya'; or 'it becomes like a caitya' or, perhaps, 'it becomes a true, a real, a fit caitya'. Of course, this range of possibilities, in terms of the compound itself, may also be expressed adjectivally: 'having become a caitya', 'being like a caitya', etc. The majority of the Vaj's western translators have chosen the option which, as we hope to show, appears least likely, or have vacillated between it and one of the other two. Conze, as we have seen, takes it to be 'like a shrine' as had Müller before him: "would be like a caitya (holy shrine)" and ". . . will

---

[6] Louis Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, T. 1 et 2, réunis (deux.éd.) Paris: 1961, 113; cf. W. D. Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar (2nd ed.) Leipzig: 1889, 493.

become like a caitya (a holy sepulchre)".[7] Shin'ya Kasugai, though not giving a translation, says twice that the caityabhūta passages are "mere simile"[8]; while Dutt, in a resumé of the passage, paraphrases it thus: ". . . the spot where the gāthā is recited becomes sacred like a stūpa."[9] Differing somewhat from this group is another group represented by de Harlez, who translates Vaj 12 as ". . . cette partie de la terre . . . deviendrait un lieu sacré, un temple", but Vaj 15c as ". . . il deviendra comme un lieu sacré"[10], and Walleser, who for Vaj 12 has ". . . dieser Ort der Erde würde ein Heiligtum sein . . ." and, for Vaj 15c, ". . . wie ein Caitya wird dieser Ort sein."[11]

---

[7] M. Müller, "The Vajracchedika or Diamond Cutter" in Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XLIX, pt. 2 (Oxford: 1894) 124; 130.

[8] Shin'ya Kasugai "Stūpa Worship in the Diamond Sūtra [orig. in Indogaku-Bukkyōgaku-Kenkyū, Vol. 2 (1953) 326-30] trans. by Hanayama Shōyū in "A Summary of Various Research on the Prajñāpāramitā Literature by Japanese Scholars" Acta Asiatica 10 (1966) 76.

[9] N. Dutt, Gilgit Manuscripts IV, XX. Dutt is not alone in associating the presence of the 'gāthā' with the sacralizing of the pṛthivīpradeśa. Haribhadra before him had asserted the association (U. Wogihara, Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā (Tokyo: 1932-35), 207; note also Āryapratītyasamutpāda-sūtra, 26.9-11 (N. A. Sastri's ed. in Āryaśālistamba Sūtra (Adyar: 1950)) where an association is made between 'caityaṃ kṛtvā' and 'pratītyasamutpādadharmadhātugāthāṃ paṭhati) and it is supported by the variant reading of Pargiter's ms. for Vaj 12 (cf. n. 2): api tu Subhūte ya(smi)n pṛthivīpradeśe dharmaparyāyā cātuṣpādā(m a)pi gāthām bhāṣyate: tena saḥ pṛthivīpradeśaḥ caityabhūto bhaviṣyati: 'Moreover, Subhūti, on which spot of earth even a gāthā having four lines from this discourse on dharma is spoken: by that, this spot of earth will become caityabhūta.' But in light of the fact that this association is sporadic and in light of the fact that the tradition centered on the 'gāthā having four lines' had a long and independent history (cf. É. Lamotte, Le traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse, T. II (Louvain: 1949) 688 n.4; Histoire du bouddhisme indien (Louvain: 1958) 547-49; L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Louvain: 1962) 369 n.17), it seems reasonable to assume that its presence here represents the intrusion of another complex of ideas into our formula and is clearly secondary.

[10] C. de Harlez, Vajracchedikā (Prajñāpāramitā): Traduite du texte Sanscrit avec comparison des versions chinoise et mandchoue [extrait du Journal Asiatique] (Paris: 1892) 29;39.

[11] Max Walleser, Prajñāpāramitā, die Vollkommenheit der Erkenntnis (Gottingen: 1914) 146, 150.

It is also to this group that our Tibetan translations belong: sa phyogs de . . . mchod rten du gyur pa yin na, for the first; but sa phyogs de mchod rten lta bur 'gyur ro for the second. There is, finally, somewhat apart from both groups, Edgerton's rendering of caityabhūta (cited from Vaj 15c) as "of the nature of an object of veneration."[12] The confusing inconsistency of the second group of translators, as well as the consistent preference of the first, are perhaps more easily accounted for by turning to an investigation of the prior member of our compound.

Poussin, discussing the terms stūpa and caitya, declared: "Les deux termes sont interchangeables depuis une haute antiquité."[13] As a consequence, we can in our modern confusion be once again consoled by the fact that it at least has the sanction of a very old tradition. This confusion has persisted in spite of the fact that as early as 1896 Kern clearly sounded a warning against it: "The most general name for a sanctuary is caitya, P[ali] cetiya, a term not only applied to buildings, but to sacred trees, memorial stones, holy spots, images, religious inscriptions, hence all edifices having the character of a sacred monument are caityas, but not all caityas are edifices."[14] And this same confusion has confused perhaps both our groups of translators.[15]

---

[12] F. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary (New Haven: 1963) 233.

[13] L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam", Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 2 (1935) 283.

[14] H. Kern, Manual of Indian Buddhism (Strassburg: 1896) 91; practically the same definition was given forty years later by B. C. Law, "A Note on 'Cetiya' in the Buddhist Literature" in B. C. Law, Geography of Early Buddhism (London: 1932) 74-80. Law enumerates as objects capable of being designated by the term caitya, "a stūpa, a vihāra, an assembly hall, a tree, a memorial stone, a holy relic or object, or place or even an image." On the pre-Buddhistic "origin" of "the caitya" see V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, "Origin and Early History of Caityas", Indian Historical Quarterly 14 (1938) 440-51, and Gisbert Combaz, "L'évolution du stūpa en Asie: les symbolismes du stūpa", Mélanges chinois et bouddhique 4 (1935-36) 27-30. For some examples of the attempts made to distinguish between the terms caitya and stūpa see I-tsing, A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago, trans. J. Takakusu (London: 1896) 121; A.Foucher, L'art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhara,

There is in almost all the above translations of our phrase an implied and more or less unconscious equation of the terms *caitya* and *stūpa*. In some, this equation is fully articulated. The line of an argument based on this more or less unconscious equation may be summarized as follows: if *caitya* in the phrase *sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet* equals *stūpa* (which is itself, at the very least, a 'structure' or 'construction'), then to say 'a spot of earth becomes a *caitya* (i.e. a 'structure' or 'construction')' does not make very good sense. Given this, and noting first that compounds which have as final member the participle *-bhūta* may have "la nuance 'qui ressemble à'", and, second, that *caitya* (=*stūpa*) stood in old Buddhist consciousness as a structure which symbolized or summarized a series of doctrinal motifs, it is reasonable to assume that the phrase *sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet* was intended to establish a comparison ("like", "comme", "wie", *lta bur*) between a particular spot and the traditional *caitya* (=*stūpa*) and thus to extend the symbolization of the latter to the former. This is, of course, eminently reasonable. But the possibility that such an interpretation misses the point, albeit narrowly, still remains. This is perhaps best illustrated by summarizing another possible argument: if (and this assumes that the early Buddhists were not as confused as we are about their basic vocabulary) *caitya* does not equal *stūpa* (=structure), then, first, it is reasonable to assume that if they intended to establish a comparison between the *pṛthivīpradeśa* and a *stūpa*, they would have used the term *stūpa*. This, however, need not be left in the category of 'reasonable assumption', for it is, as we will see in several passages of the *Saddharma Puṇḍarīka*, a

---

Vol. I (Paris: 1905) 60; W. Geiger, *The Mahāvaṃsa* (London: 1912) 295-96 (appendix D).

[15] It should be noted that the Tibetan translations have, rather than clarifying the situation, supported the confusion, if not added to it; and this because Tibetan has only a single term, *mchod rten*, which serves to translate both *caitya* and *stūpa*. As a consequence, the Tibetan in itself can offer no clear guide as to which of the two terms occurred in the original Sanskrit which it translates.

demonstrable fact. On the other hand, disallowing the caitya/stūpa equation and noting that the equation caitya = 'spot' or 'place' is attested, then to apply the comparison/simile interpretation in such a situation makes even less sense (i.e. 'the spot of earth becomes "like" a spot (of earth) or a place') and is clearly not acceptable. The alternative interpretation, simply that 'the spot of earth becomes a caitya', fares better and is preferable, but it too may miss the essential point of the phrase; that is, that the presence (in some form) of a dharmaparyāya (in this case the Prajñāpāramitā) in a particular place has the effect of sacralizing that place in a way which is different from, if not opposed to, the sacralization effected by the presence of a stūpa. To clarify and concretize this last remark we are able, happily, to cite a close variant of the phrase 'sa pṛthivīpradeśaś, etc.' which occurs outside of the Vaj and in a much fuller context.

Conze, in Buddhist Wisdom Books (p. 50), says: "The saying about the shrine, caitya, . . . is taken over from the Version in 8000 lines (iii 56-57)". He is more cautious in his edition of the text (Vaj [SOR XIII], p. 37) where he refers to Aṣṭasāhasrikā (=AsP) iii 57 as a "parallel". There are problems in expressing the relationship between the Vaj and AsP passages in either one of these two ways. For the first, it is necessary to assume, as has been assumed, the chronological priority of the AsP to the Vaj. For the second, it is necessary to make clear the possible limits of parallelism. Again, a satisfactory solution to the first, which by necessity would require a set of complex chronological arguments, is clearly beyond the scope of the present paper. It is, however, worth noting that a number of Japanese scholars have suggested a date for the Vaj which is considerably earlier than the one suggested by Conze[16], and that the exact nature of the relationship

[16] H. Nakamura, "A Critical Survey of Mahāyāna and Esoteric Buddhism chiefly based on Japanese Studies" Acta Asiatica 6 (1964) 64-65; Hakuju Ui

between the Vaj and the AsP is far from clear.[17] For a solution to the second it will perhaps be more useful to first give the passage in quotation. We quote, for the sake of brevity, Conze's condensed translation:

> AsP (Mitra) 55.22-59.5, (Wogihara) 205.13-212.12, (Vaidya) 28.10-29.27; Pek. Vol. 21 no. 734, 71-3-3 to 72-1-7 (Conze's trans., (I)[18] 24-25; (II) 104-106)

"Chronological Survey of the Vajracchedikā-Prajñāpāramitā" [from Nagoya-Daigaku-Bungakubu-Kenkyū-Ronshū XXI, Nagoya, 1958, pp. 49-51] trans. by Hanayama Shōyū, "SURPPL" (cf. n.8) 55-61. Ui says "judging from its contents, this sūtra gives us the impression that it is a very old sūtra" (p.56); and ". . . the latest date of the establishment of the Diamond Sūtra will be 200 A.D. or probably 150 A.D., though we cannot decide the earliest possible date of this sūtra" (p.60). Conze, on the other hand, places it "before A.D. 400" (E. Conze, The Prajñāpāramitā Literature (The Hague: 1960) 18) or in the fourth century (Selected Sayings, p. 14), or 350 A.D. (Indo-Iranian Journal 3 (1959) 234.

17 For example, Conze has pointed out a number of places where the Vaj "contains distinct reminiscences from the Aṣṭasāhasrikā" (Vaj [SOR XIII] 9). When, however, these "reminiscences" are carefully scrutinized it becomes apparent that if they are in fact "reminiscences", a number of them are of a decidedly peculiar nature. One of the passages cited by Conze is, of course, the phrase sa pṛthivīpradeśaś, etc., which, as we will show below, could have been "borrowed" from at least one other, possibly more, non-Prajñāpāramitā sources. Another is Vaj 7 where in explanation as to why yo 'sau tathāgatena dharmo 'bhisambuddho deśito vā agrāhyaḥ so 'nabhilapyaḥ, na sa dharmo nādharmaḥ it is asserted that asaṃskṛtaprabhāvitā hy āryapudgalāḥ. As "reminiscence" to this, Conze cites AsP ii 36; but the latter is only a 'formal' "reminiscence"; that is, it repeats the basic idea (in a more detailed form), but it denies its statement at Vaj 7 by denying its tenability as an 'idea', and thus AsP ii 36 rather than paralleling Vaj 7 marks instead a clear doctrinal advancement of its basic idea: as a part of a series of statements as to how a Bodhisattva should stand in prajñāpāramitā, the AsP says: srotaāpattiphalam asaṃskṛtaprabhāvitam iti na sthātavyam, evaṃ sakṛdāgāmiphalam arhattvam asaṃskṛtaprabhāvitam iti na sthātavyam. The same pattern is observable in the relationship between Vaj 9d and AsP 455. In the former the "dwelling" of Subhūti receives a positive valence, while in the latter it is clearly made subservient to the dwelling of a Bodhisattva. In both instances the corresponding AsP passage seems, if anything, to be a reworking of an earlier form of the "idea" in the Vaj; and at least this much is clear: the latter is not an "abbreviation" or condensation of the former.

18 R. Mitra, Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā [Biblio. Indica 110] (Calcutta: 1888); U. Wogihara, Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā (Tokyo: 1932-35); P. L. Vaidya, Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary Called Āloka [Budd. Skt. Text 4] (Darbanga: 1960); E. Conze, trans. Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā [Biblio. Indica 284] (Calcutta: 1958); E. Conze, The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary (Bolinas, Calif.: 1973). Reference is, unless otherwise noted, to Mitra's ed.

"Further, where this perfection of wisdom has been written down in a book, and has been put up and worshipped, where it has been taken up, etc., there men and ghosts [amanusya] can do no harm, except as a punishment for past deeds. This is another advantage even here and now.

Just, Kauśika, as those men and ghosts who have gone to the terrace of enlightenment, or to its circumference, or its interior or to the foot of the tree of enlightenment, cannot be hurt by men, or ghosts, or be injured by them, or taken possession of, even with the help of evil animal beings, except as a punishment for former deeds. Because in it the past, future and present Tathagatas win their enlightenment, they who promote in all beings and who reveal to them fearlessness, lack of hostility, lack of fright. Just so, Kauśika, the place in which one takes up, etc., this perfection of wisdom, in it beings cannot be hurt by men and ghosts. Because this perfection of wisdom makes the spot of earth where it is into a true shrine for beings, -- worthy of being worshipped and adored, -- into a shelter for beings who come to it, a refuge, a place of rest and final relief. This is another advantage even here and now. [Anayaiva hi Kauśika prajñāpāramitayā pṛthivīpradeśaḥ sattvānāṃ caityabhūtaḥ kṛto (Kau śi ka śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di ñid kyis sa phyogs de sems can rnams kyi mchod rten du gyur par byas pa) vandanīyo mānanīyaḥ pūjanīyo 'rcanīyo 'pacāyanīyaḥ satkaranīyo gurukaranīyas, trāṇaṃ śaraṇaṃ layanaṃ parāyaṇaṃ kṛto bhaviṣyati tatropagatānāṃ sattvānām. imam api sa Kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā dṛṣṭadhārmikāṃ guṇaṃ parigṛhṇāti.]

Śakra: Suppose that there are two persons. One of the two, a son or daughter of good family, has written down this perfection of wisdom, made a copy of it; he would then put it up, and would honour, revere, worship, and adore it with heavenly flowers, incense, perfumes, wreaths, unguents, aromatic powders, strips of cloth, parasols, banners, bells, flags, with rows of lamps all round, and with manifold kinds of worship. The other would deposit in Stupas the relics of the Tathagata who has gone to Parinirvana; he would take hold of them and preserve them; he would honour, worship and adore them with heavenly flowers, incense, etc., as before. Which one of the two, O Lord, would beget the greater merit?

The Lord: I will question you on this point, and you may answer to the best of your abilities. The Tathagata, when he had acquired and known full enlightenment or all-knowledge, in which practices did he train the all-knowledge-personality [sarvajñatātmabhāva] which he had brought forth?

Śakra: By the Lord training himself in just this perfection of wisdom has the Tathagata acquired and known full enlightenment or all-knowledge.

The Lord: Therefore the Tathagata does not derive his name from the fact that he has acquired this physical personality [ātmabhāvaśarīra], but from the fact that he has acquired all-knowledge. And this all-knowledge of the Tathagata has come forth from the perfection of wisdom. The physical personality of the Tathagata, on the other hand, is the result of the skill in means of the perfection of wisdom. And that becomes a sure foundation for the (acquisition of the) cognition of the all-knowing (by others). Supported by this foundation the revelation of the cognition of the all-knowing takes place, the revelation of the Buddha-body, of the Dharma-body [dharmaśarīra], of the Samgha body. The acquisition of the physical personality is thus the cause of the cognition

of the all-knowing. As the sure foundation of that cognition it has, for all beings, become a true shrine, worthy of being saluted respectfully, of being honoured, revered and adored. [Ity evaṃ sarvajñajñānahetuko 'yam ātmabhāvaśarīrapratilambhaḥ sarvajñajñānāśrayābhūtatvāt sarvasattvānāṃ caityabhūto (sems can tham cad kyi mchod rten du gyur ciṅ) vandanīyaḥ satkaraṇīyo gurukaraṇīyo mānanīyaḥ pūjanīyo 'rcanīyo 'pacāyanīyaḥ saṃvṛtto bhavati.] After I have gone to Parinirvana, my relics also will be worshipped. It is for this reason that the person who would copy and worship the perfection of wisdom would beget the greater merit. For in doing so, he would worship the cognition of the all-knowing.

Perhaps our citation of such a long passage will be partially forgiven in light of its intrinsic interest and the richness of the context which it establishes for the phrase sa pṛthivīpradeśaś, etc. Our first order of business is to establish to what degree and in what sense this passage is parallel to Vaj 12 & 15c. However, before this is possible it is first necessary to make some minor adjustments in the translation suggested by Conze. The Sanskrit for the first paragraph of the above quotation reads: punaraparaṃ Kauśika yatreyaṃ prajñāpāramitā antaśo likhitvā pustakagatāṃ kṛtvā pūjāpūrvaṃgamaṃ sthāpayitvā na satkariṣyate nodgrahīṣyate na dhārayiṣyate na vācayiṣyate, etc. Now Conze, as we have seen, in attempting to abbreviate the passage somewhat, has translated it as: "Further, where this perfection of wisdom has been written down in a book, and has been put up and worshipped, where it has been taken up, etc." His abbreviation has, however, perhaps unwittingly misrepresented the intended statement of the text. To read the passage as Conze does requires that both the antaśaś and the string of negatives be ignored, and that sthāpayitvā be taken in a strict literal sense rather than in its more usual (in Buddhist texts)

idiomatic sense. This appears too free a reading and it is preferable to read it as: "Again, Kauśika, where this Prajñāpāramitā is, [one] so much as having only written it down, having made it into a book [and], apart from going in front of it to worship, one will not honor it, will not take it up, will not bear it in mind, will not recite it . . .". With this modification made we can now move towards sorting out the nature of the suggested parallelism. First of all it is clear that the phrase as it occurs at AsP 57 is not, in a formal sense, strictly parallel to either Vaj 12 or Vaj 15c. Two things set off the former from the latter: (1) AsP 56 has, as the verb of the phrase, kṛta instead of bhavati; (2) the instrumentality by which the action of the verb is set in motion in the case of the AsP is no longer an action in reference to the dharmaparyāya (i.e. reciting a verse of it, 'illuminating', etc.), but is the dharmaparyāya itself, its mere presence. This is in reference only to the form of the phrase sa pṛthivīpradeśaś, etc. as found in the AsP. When, however, we move out to examine the larger context in which the phrase is found we find a similar shift in emphasis. The emphasis in the AsP is clearly on the presence of the dharmaparyāya in written, book form. This is in curious contradistinction to the Vaj passages where the dharmaparyāya in book form has no place. In the entire Vaj there is only a single reference to writing. It occurs at 15a as part of the formulaic expression: kaḥ punar vādo yo likhitvodgṛhṇīyād dhārayed vācayet paryavāpnuyāt parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet. It is odd, however, that this same enumeration of activities occurs at least twelve other times, twice in very close proximity to the sa pṛthivīpradeśaś phrase (cf. 12 and 15b; as well as 8, 11, 13e, 14b, 14h, 16a, 16b, 24, and 32a) and yet none of these other enumerations include reference to writing.[19] Here again it seems hardly possible to

[19] Ui ("Chronological Survey", p. 56) says that these facts "may show

account for this situation by assuming that the Vaj is an "abbreviation": rather, it would appear that we have here another example of the kind pointed out in note 17, where an AsP passage appears to represent a later development of a vaguely "parallel" passage in the Vaj. That is to say, that in reference specifically to the sa pṛthivīpradeśaś phrase, as well as to the parallel of the given contexts, the parallelism is of such a nature as to indicate a clear shift/development of emphasis from the Vaj to the AsP. In this instance the shift appears to be from a situation in which the orientation is primarily towards an oral tradition (Vaj) to a situation in which the orientation is primarily to a written tradition (AsP). Given the generally assumed chronological priority of the AsP to the Vaj this is exactly the opposite of what one might expect. Before, however, turning to a closer analysis of the AsP passage in itself, we must pause and note a number of passages which are, in turn, "parallel" to the AsP/Vaj "parallel" which we have been discussing.

The importance or continued importance of this section on the cult of the book, and of the sa pṛthivīpradeśaś phrase which stands at the beginning of it, for the compilers of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature, is attested to by the fact that both are found in all the larger redactions of this group of texts.[20] Further, this section (though not the exact phrase)

---

that copying the sūtra is not regarded as an important factor to gain merit from it. Even in this case where 'likhitvā' [is] used, this expression is not appropriate, judging from the context of the sūtra, or I may even say that it is better not to have this term here."

[20] Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā, Pek. Vol. 19, no. 732, 313-3-6 & 7; Pañcaviṃśati, Pek. Vol. 18, no. 731, 227-2-6; Śatasāhasrikā, Pek. Vol. 14, no. 730, 115-4-7; the phrase is translated by all three in almost exactly the same way, so we give here only the rendering found in the Pañcaviṃśati: śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa 'di ñid kyis sa'i phyogs de sems can thams cad kyi mchod rten du byas pas. Cf. E. Conze, The Large Sūtra on Perfect Wisdom with the Divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra, pts. II & III (Madison: 1966) pp. 231 ff. The Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra (É. Lamotte, Le traité de la Grande

has a corresponding section in the Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā.[21] But it was not just to the compilers of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature that such arguments were important. We find outside of this particular body of texts a number of independent texts which also contain arguments against the relic/stūpa cult in more or less close conjunction with a proselytism connected with the cult of the book. This is the case, for example, with both the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa[22] and the Suvarṇabhāsottama-Sūtra.[23] And it was not just among the compilers of the Prajñā texts that the phrase sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet had currency. It is to be found in at least three separate texts which are independent of this tradition, and a fourth has, on at least three occasions, what is certainly a conscious adaptation of the phrase. It is from these more specific "parallels" that we may hope to gain additional information bearing on our analysis.

Vertu de Sagesse, T. I (Louvain: 1949) 24) gives as the 13th of 19 reasons why the Buddha preached "the Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra" the following: "En outre, il prêche le Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra pour marquer la différence de rétribution (vipāka) entre le culte (pūjā) rendu au corps de naissance (janmakāya) et le culte rendu au corps de la loi (dharmakāya). Reportez-vous au chapitre du Chö li t'a (Śarīra stuti) [chapter 32 in Conze's synoptic table (The Prajñāpāramitā Literature (The Hague: 1960) 48]."

[21] E. Obermiller, Prajñā-Pāramitā-Ratna-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā [Bibli. Budd. 29] (Leningrad: 1937, reprint 1970) 22-6; cf. E. Conze "Verses on the Accumulation of Precious Qualities (Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā)" in Indo-Asian Studies, ed. Inter. Acad. of Ind. Culture (New Delhi: 1962) 133 ff.

[22] Esp. Ch. 12; cf. Jisshu Oshika, ed. "Tibetan Text of Vimalakīrtinirdeśa" Acta Indologica, I (1970) 233-40; É. Lamotte, L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Louvain: 1962) 377 ff. Strictly speaking the argument is not against the relic/stūpa cult (except at Oshika 32.21-33.17; Lamotte, para. num. 4 & 5) in the Vkn; the latter uses the more generic term, āmiṣa, and expresses the opposition thus: "C'est pourquoi, Ô Devendra, il faut adorer (pūj-) les Tathāgata, non pas par des objets matériels (āmiṣa), mais par le culte de la loi (dharmapūjā); il faut les vénérer (satkṛ-) non pas par des objets matériels, mais par l'hommage à la loi (dharmasatkāra)," Lamotte, 387. It appears, also that the Vkn. has gone a long way toward 'rationalizing' or 'mentalizing' the cult of the book.

[23] Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra, Das Goldglanz-Sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus (Leipzig: 1937) 12-19 (for the argument on relics; but see also pp. 203-06 where a different position is maintained) and pp. 4,64, 68,70,71,73,75,77,84,86,88,89,98,124,126-27 (esp.), 151 (on book worship); cf. R. E. Emmerick, The Sūtra of Golden Light [Sac. Books of Budd. 27] (London: 1970) 5-8; and 2,23,25, etc.

The first of these occurs in the Kāśyapaparivarta, (=KP) a text which, along with the AsP, is among the oldest examples of early Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature. Our phrase occurs in a context which is similar in basic outline to AsP 57-59 and Vimalakīrti (Oshika) 32.21-33.17 in which a comparison is set up between the merit derived from relic worship and the merit derived from taking up, etc. a gāthā, etc. from "this Mahāratnakūṭa, king of sūtrāntas", and the advantages of hearing it, writing, etc. Except at the beginning, the Sanskrit text of this particular passage is very fragmentary. We will as a consequence cite the Tibetan text with the Skt. inserted where possible.

Sa phyogs gaṅ du chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di bśad pa 'am/bstan pa 'am/yi ger 'dri ba 'am/yi ger bris nas glegs bam du byas te bźag pa'i sa phyogs de lha daṅ bcas pa'i 'jig rten gyi mchod rten daṅ'dra bar 'gyur ro/ [Yatra ca pṛthivīpradeśe ayaṃ ratnakūṭo dharmaparyāyo bhāṣyate vā deśyate vā likhyate vā . . . vā pustagataṃ vā tiṣṭhet sa pṛthivīpradeśe caityabhūto sadevakasya lokasya ("Und wo an einem Flecke der Erde diese Abhandlung der Lehre Edelsteinhaufe verkündet oder gelehrt oder geschrieben wird, oder, nachdem sie geschrieben worden, in Buchform gebracht aufbewahrt wird, dieser Fleck der Erde ist für die Welt, einschliesslich der der Götter, ein Heiligtum geworden")] su źig chos smra ba las [dharmabhāṇakasya] chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di ñan pa 'am/'dzin pa 'am yi ger 'dri ba de la 'di lta ste/de bźin gśegs pa la ji ltar bya ba de bźin du gus par bya'o // 'od sruṅ rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gaṅ źig de bźin gśegs pa'i chos smra ba la bkur sti byed pa daṅ /btsun par byed pa daṅ / ri mor byed pa daṅ mchod par byed pa de la ṅa bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub tu luṅ ston to / de 'chi ba'i dus kyi tshe de bźin gśegs

pa mthoṅ bar 'gyur ro [cāsya tathāgatadarśānaṃ bhaviṣyati].[24]

The Tibetan might be translated:

> The spot of earth where this discourse on dharma is spoken or explained or written down or [where] after having been written down it is made into a book and it is put up, that spot of earth becomes equal to [or, 'like'] a caitya for the world together with its gods. Who hears this discourse on dharma from a reciter of dharma, or takes it up, or writes it; just as to the Tathāgata it will be made, so [to him] will reverence be shown. O Kāśyapa, whatever son or daughter of good family will do homage to a reciter of dharma of the Tathāgata, will honor, venerate and worship [him]; from that I predict [that kulaputra] to utmost right and perfect enlightenment. He, at the hour of death, will come to see the Tathāgata.

In the Sanskrit of our phrase in KP the second pṛthivīpradeśa has the form °-deśe, which is apparently a scribal error. That this is so is more apparent in the texts for which we have a fuller critical apparatus. If we jump ahead a bit, it will be seen that one of Konow's ms. for the Aparimitāyur (see below p.21) also has °-deśe here, while Walleser's ms. preserves what is probably the correct form °-deśo. Also, one of the five mss. of the Amoghapāśahṛdaya (see below p.22) reads °-deśe for the second pṛthivīpradeśa, while the other four appear to read °-deśo. The Tibetan for all versions of our phrase — sa phyogs de — also indicates a nominative form as the correct reading. The form °-deśe probably results from the scribe having mechanically reproduced for the second occurrence the form of the first. A second point in

---

[24] Both the Skt. and Tib. are cited from Baron A. Von Staël-Holstein, The Kāśyapaparivarta, A Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class (Shanghai: 1926) para. 160; the German from the trans. of the Skt./Tib. by F. Weller, Zum Kāśyapaparivarta [Abh. d. Sachs. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, Bd. 57, Heft 2] (Berlin: 1965) para. 160.

terms of the language of the passage concerns the compound caityabhūta. In this instance the Tib. translators have clearly understood the compound to have the sense of 'like' or 'equal to'. The translation mchod rten daṅ 'dra bar 'gyur ro which we find here is similar in sense to the Tib. for Vaj 15c: mchod rten lta bur 'gyur ro (Das gives 'dra ba and lta bu as synonyms[25]) and, like the latter, differs from the Tib. for Vaj 12, AsP 57 & 58, and all the larger redactions of the Prajñāpāramitā).

Apart from questions of language, we are still confronted with the question of the limits of "parallelism", here between both the KP and the AsP, on the one hand, and between the KP and the Vaj, on the other. If, as it appears we must, we take at least paragraphs 158,159 and 160 of the KP as forming a continuous piece, then it is clear that the KP, in that it is constructing a comparison between the relative power of stūpa/relic worship as compared with that of some activity ('taking up', etc.) directed toward or associated with the dharmaparyāya, is basically parallel in sense to AsP 57-59. In that one of these activities is 'writing' or 'making into a book', and in that this receives a prominent place, the KP is once again like the AsP. But, in reference to the sa pṛthivīpradeśa phrase in itself, the KP, by inserting reference to writing directly into the phras[illegible]s unlike both the AsP and the Vaj. If we were to stop here we would have to classify the KP, in reference to its oral or written orientation, with the AsP. There is, however, a further consideration which renders such a classification doubtful. There is one important aspect in which the KP is more like the Vaj

---

25 S. C. Das, A Tibetan-English Dictionary (Calcutta: 1902, reprinted 1970) 695[2]. It should be noted also that according to Jäschke (A Tibetan-English Dictionary (London: 1881 reprinted 1968) 282[1], 'dra ba) the two notions 'similar' and 'equal' "are not strictly distinguished from each other."

(esp. Vaj 12) and by which both are definitely set off from AsP. This is the fact that in both texts, immediately after the articulation of the sa pṛthivīpradeśa phrase, the emphasis suddenly shifts away from the "spot of earth" and falls on the person who recites, etc. the dharmaparyāya. Not only this, but both texts then express an implied equation between the reciter or hearer and the Tathāgata (śāstṛ in the Vaj). Thus, if we were to talk in terms of "distinct reminiscences", it seems much more likely that if the Vaj (again esp. 12) were a "distinct reminiscence" of anything, it would be of the KP and not the AsP. As regards the KP, then, the final impression is that, in spite of its references to writing, its primary orientation is still to the oral tradition. This impression is perhaps supported by the fact that the KP, unlike the AsP, is without the elaborate references to worshipping the dharmaparyāya with 'incense, flags and bells', etc.

Strictly speaking, from the point of view of an unfortunately not very strict chronology, we should here turn to the occurrences of our phrase in the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka (= SP). Since, however, the treatment of our phrase by the SP exhibits a striking peculiarity which is best treated on its own, we will for the moment set it aside and look instead at our phrase as it occurs in the Aparimitāyuḥ-sūtra, the Amoghapāśahṛdaya-sūtra and the Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (the reasons for treating this text here and not with the other Prajñā texts will, I hope, be obvious). All three of these texts, but especially the first two, belong to that intriguing genre of Buddhist Literature in which almost the whole of a given text is given over to describing its own great power and the great practical advantages to be gained by reciting or writing or worshipping it. These documents are significant both from a religious point of view and from the more general

point of view of a conception of the "function" of "literature" within a religious community. However, this must be left for another time.

For the Aparimitāyuḥ (= Ap)[26] there is no doubt about its primary emphasis being on the book in written form. The body of the text (para. 3) begins with a reference to not only writing the text, but worshipping it in book form with incense, perfumes, etc. Then there is reference to writing in para. 4 & 6, followed by ten paragraphs almost exactly alike saying 'then, at that time, so many (the number of changes) Buddhas recited the Ap'. From para. 16 to 27 the constant refrain is: ya idam Aparimitāyuḥsūtram likhiṣyati likhāpayiṣyati sa . . . etc. (advantages are different in each para.). It is as one of this series, the second to the last, that the sa pṛthivī-pradeśa phrase occurs. It should be noted however that its independence from this series is betrayed by the fact that it clearly breaks the pattern. From para. 16 to para. 25 each section begins ya idam aparimitāyuḥsūtram, etc.; at para. 26 (our phrase), we suddenly get yasmin pṛthivīpradeśe idam aparimitāyuḥsūtram, etc.; and then para. 27 once again begins ya idam, etc. The whole phrase is as follows:

Yasmin pṛthivīpradeśe idam aparimitāyuḥsūtram likhiṣyanti likhāpayiṣyanti, sa pṛthivīpradeśaḥ caityabhūto vandanīyaś ca bhaviṣyati

Sa phyogs su dkon mchog mdo sde 'di 'drir bar 'gyur ba'i sa phyogs de yaṅ mchod rten du 'gyur te phyag 'tshal bar 'gyur ro

---

[26] We refer throughout to the edition of S. Konow, "The Aparimitāyuḥ Sūtra, the Old Khotanese Version together with the Sanskrit Text and the Tibetan Translation" in Hoernle, Manuscript Remains, 289-329; but see also M. Walleser, Aparimitāyur-jñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtram: Nach einer nepalesischen Sanskrit-Handschrift mit der tibetischen und chinesischen Version [Sb.d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss. philo-hist. kl. Jg. 1916, Abh. 12] Heidelberg: 1916.

"That country in which they thus write the Aparimitāyuḥsūtra, that country would become worthy of worship like a caitya."[27]

The next two documents in which our phrase occurs are, from the point of view of content, primarily tantric. This fact, however much we might expect, has had no appreciable influence on the articulation of the phrase. And this in spite of fact that the first text to be treated here, the Amoghapāśahṛdaya sūtra (= Am), presents us with the first significant formal alteration of the basic vocabulary of the phrase. We can cite for the Am three different versions: a Sanskrit "original" and two Tibetan translations. All are cited from the editions of R. O. Meisezahl.[28] The Sanskrit text, which Meisezahl describes as a "fragmentary Nepalese palm-leaf ms. (University Library, Cambridge Or. Ms. 152)" reads as follows (p. 313.15-21):

> yasmiṃś ca punar bhagavan pṛthivīpradeśe / idam amoghapāśahṛdayaṃ pracaret // veditavyaṃ bhagavans tasmin pṛthivīpradeśe/ īśvaramaheśvarabrahmakāyikapramukhāni dvādaśadevaputraśatasahasrāṇi rakṣāvaraṇaguptaye sthāsyanti // caityasammato bhagavan sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati / yatredam amogha[pā]śahṛdayam pracariṣyati.

The first Tibetan translation, described as an "Early Tun-huang Version (Ms. Pelliot Tibetain 49)" has for our phrase (p. 280.9-12): bcom ldan

---

27 The English trans. is Konow's. For the Skt. two of his ms. (C & C²) produce the following variants: "C vandanīyaś ca (C² here adds bhaviṣyanti) pradakṣiṇīyaś (C² -ṇīyaś) ca pūjanīyaś ca bhaviṣyanti." In addition his ms. C² has aparimitāyusūtraṃ ratnarājaṃ for aparimitāyuḥsūtram, and C³ has aparimitāyusūtraṃ bhāṣitaṃ ratna. His Tib. text does not, strictly, correspond to any of the three, and both versions of the text preserved in the Pek. ed. are, in turn, different both at this point and in other minor ways from the Tib. given by Konow. Pek. Vol. 7, no. 361-303-1-8 to 2-1 reads: sa phyogs gaṅ du mdo sde dkon mchog 'di 'dri ba'i sa phyogs de yaṅ mchod rten du 'gyur te phyag bya bar yaṅ 'os par 'gyur ro; no. 362,305-1-8 to 2-1 has: sa phyogs gaṅ du mdo sde 'di 'dri ba'i sa phyogs de yaṅ mchod rten du 'gyur te / phyag bya ba'i 'os su 'gyur ro. Walleser's Skt. for the first

'das don yod pa'i źags pa'i sñiṅ po/ gaṅ du byuṅ ba'i sa phyogs de / mchod rten du kun gis bkur bar 'gyur ro. //; and the "Later Kanjur Version" (p.301. 24-26 also Pek. ed. Vol. 8, no. 366, 104-4-4): gaṅ 'dir don yod źags pa'i sñiṅ po rab tu spyod na bcom ldan 'das sa'i phyogs gcig po de mchod rten du 'gyur po.

The alteration in the vocabulary introduced by the Am is, of course, the substitution of caitya-sammata for the caitya-bhūta of our previous texts. The former may mean 'regarded, thought of as a caitya' or 'an esteemed, highly honored (thought highly of) caitya'. The second possibility is more firmly supported by the Tibetan of the Tun-huang text which Meisezahl translates: "This part of the earth will be revered (bkur bar 'gyur ro) as a holy place" (p. 290), and which thus emphasizes the aspect of honoring, revering. The later Kanjur version, on the other hand, differs somewhat from both the Skt. and the Tun-huang Tib. and may perhaps be translated: 'that spot of earth alone (gcig po) becomes a caitya'. However the details be ultimately interpreted, it appears that both the use of the compound caitya-sammata and both Tib. translations are attempts to express the singularity or the greater degree of sacredness attaching to this particular kind of caitya; it does not become simply a caitya, but a "highly honored caitya"; 'it alone or only becomes a caitya'. If we assume an equivalence between caitya-sammata and caitya-bhūta, then we must see

---

instance is closest to Konow's ms. C except that in every case °-nīyaś is written °-nīyaś; for the second, his ms. reads aparimitāyu-sūtra-ratna. He trans.: "An welchem Ort der Erde man diese Kostbarkeit des Aparimitāyuh-Sūtra schreiben wird, schreiben lassen wird, dieser Ort der Erde auch wird zu einem Caitya werden, mit Ehrfurcht zu begrüssen, nach rechts zu umgehen, zu verehren."

28 R. O. Meisezahl, "The Amoghapāśahṛdaya-dhāraṇi, The Early Sanskrit Manuscript of the Reiunji Critically Edited and Translated", Monumenta Nipponica 17 (1962) 264-328.

-bhūta in the latter expressing in some sense that which -sammata expresses in the former.[29] Another small but important point to be noted is that Meisezahl, by simply translating caitya as "a sacred place", has appreciably reduced the potential ambiguity of the phrase.

The whole of the Sanskrit passage might be translated as follows:

> And again, O Blessed One, on which spot of earth this Amoghapāśahṛdaya would circulate, it is to be known that on that spot of earth, O Blessed One, 12 x 100,000 deva-putras headed by Īśvaras, Maheśvaras and the devas belonging to Brahma will dwell for the purpose of protecting and shielding and guarding [it]. That spot of earth, O Blessed One, where this Amoghapāśahṛdaya will circulate will become a highly honored sacred place.

For the next text we will consider, the Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā (= Adh), we are able to cite only the Tibetan; the corresponding Sanskrit has not been preserved in the fragmentary Sanskrit/Khotanese manuscript which has come down to us.

Adh 32.10:

> Chos kyi rnam grańs 'di gań na spyod pa'i sa phyogs de mchod rten du 'gyur ro / chos kyi rnam grańs 'di gań gi lus la thogs sam/ glegs bam la bris te spyod pa'i gań zag de phyag bya ba'i gnas su 'gyur ro /

> "The spot of earth where this discourse on dharma is practiced will be like a true shrine. The person who practices this

[29] It should be noted here that one of Meisezahl's manuscripts has instead of caitya-sammata, caitya-sadharmmato (p.313 n.55), which I cannot readily explain. For the Tib., Meisezahl notes that his reading gcig po is a correction for gcig pa, but does not state which ed. this refers to; the Pek. ed. clearly reads gcig po. Also, it should be noted that E. Benveniste (Textes sogdiens (Paris: 1940) 93-104) has published an edition and trans. of a Sogdian version

discourse on dharma -- whether he has heard it from someone or read it in a book -- is worthy of reverence."[30]

Both Adh and Am introduce into the phrase a new main verb. The sacralizing power of the dharmaparyāya is not here effected by its recitation or its mere presence, but by its being "circulated". This is perhaps the primary meaning here of (rab tu) spyod pa = pracarati, and a similar usage in association with texts is to be found, for example, at AsP 459 and Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra 129 (see R.E. Emmerick, The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra (London: 1970) 11, 96 [Tib.]). Conze's translation "practice" as Meisezahl's translation of 'byuṅ ba as "perform", is perhaps unwarranted, although the possibility of a specialized meaning of (rab tu) spyod pa in a tantric context cannot be ruled out in light of the elusive vocabulary of these documents. What is perhaps more important is that in spite of the marked shifts of emphasis in the orientation of the texts as a whole, our phrase has retained intact its basic structure and most of its characteristic elements. This observation holds even in light of the alterations introduced by Adh and Am. As regards the treatment of what we assume to be our compound in the Tibetan translation of the Adh, it is interesting to note that its rendering mchod rten du 'gyur ro corresponds neither with the innovative caityasammata of the Sanskrit Am, nor with its Tun-huang translation. Its correspondence with the late

---

of the Am. He translates our phrase: "En quelque terre, en quelque lieu, honoré du Monde, que se trouve ce mantra-hṛdaya, en cet endroit les īśvaras, maheśvaras, et douze koṭis de devaputras viennent protéger cette créature; cet endroit et cette terre seront pareillement un vihāra et un stūpa" (p.95).

30 The Tib. text is cited from the edition of S. Toganoo, Rishukyō no Kenkyū (1930) 1-33, recently reprinted (with the original pagination) in Yukio Hatta, Index to the Ārya-Prajñāpāramitā-Naya-Śata-Pañcāśatikā (Kyoto: 1971) 193-225. The English translation is from E. Conze, "The Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā" in Studies of Esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism, ed. Koyasan University (Koyasan: 1965) 115. The second sentence might better be translated as: 'He who carries this discourse on dharma within himself, or [by whom], after being written in a book, it is circulated, that man becomes an object to be honored'.

Kanjur version of Am is also problematic since it is difficult to know what the Sanskrit was which underlies this translation. Except for the gcig po, the Adh and the late Am translations are exactly alike. It is not impossible that the late Am translation represents yet another possible translation of the compound caityabhūta. Here the Tibetan translator may have understood the -bhūta as denoting emphasis, but rather than allowing the emphasis to adhere to mchod rten, he attached it (in the form of gcig po) to sa'i phyogs. This, however, remains uncertain.

Perhaps we have been too quick in observing that our phrase, though handed from text to different text, has retained intact its basic structure and its characteristic elements of vocabulary. Now, when we come to the next and final set of passages which we will consider, this observation can no longer stand unmodified. The Saddharma Puṇḍarīka has, in presenting our phrase, allowed the basic structure and some elements of its vocabulary to stand unchanged, while at the same time it has replaced or modified other elements of that vocabulary. These modifications are undoubtedly to be accounted for by the fact that of all the texts in which our phrase is found, the SP is the only one which gives both a positive and a prominent place to the worship of the relic stūpa.[31] This new presence, however, finds itself sharing the stage with an equally prominent and fully articulated cult of the book[32] and, ultimately, it is the attempt to unite the two which accounts for the form in which our phrase finds itself.

The phrase occurs three times; first at SP (Kern & Nanjio) 231.7-232.5;

---

[31] SP (Kern & Nanjio) 7,14,26,50,51,52,150-54,203,239-52,259,299,338-40, 387,411-12,430,436,446,486.

[32] SP (Kern & Nanjio) 99,225,226,230,267,286,297,337,342,390,402,403,417, 418.

(Wogihara & Tsuchida) 201.13-17; (Dutt) 153.19-154.6; (Vaidya) 145.22-31; Pek. Vol. 30, no. 781, 42-1-8 to 2-1; Burnouf trans. 140-41; Kern trans. 220:[33]

Yasmin khalu punar Bhaiṣajyarāja pṛthivīpradeśe 'yaṃ dharmaparyāyo bhāṣyeta vā deśyeta vā likhyeta vā likhito vā pustakagataḥ svādhyāyeta vā saṃgāyeta vā, tasmin Bhaiṣajyarāja pṛthivīpradeśe tathāgatacaityaṃ kārayitavyaṃ mahantaṃ ratnamayam uccaṃ pragṛhītaṃ [sa phyogs der sman gyi rgyal po de bźin gśegs pa'i mchod rten rin po che las byas ba mtho źiṅ che ba bya'o] na ca tasminn avaśyaṃ tathāgataśarīrāṇi pratiṣṭhāpayitavyāni. Tatkasya hetoḥ? Ekaghanam eva tasmiṃs tathāgataśarīram upanikṣiptaṃ bhavati. Yasmin pṛthivīpradeśe 'yaṃ dharmaparyāyo bhāṣyeta vā deśyeta vā paṭhyeta vā saṃgāyeta vā likhyeta vā likhito vā pustakagatas tiṣṭhet; tasmiṃś ca stūpe satkāro gurukāro mānanā pūjanārcanā karaṇīyā sarva-puṣpa-dhūpa-gandha-mālya-vilepana-cūrṇa-cīvara-cchattra-dhvaja-patākā-vaijayantībhiḥ sarva-gīta-vādya-nṛtya-tūrya-tāḍāvacara-saṃgīti-saṃpravāditaiḥ pūjā karaṇīyā. Ye ca khalu punar Bhaiṣajyarāja sattvāstaṃ tathāgatacaityaṃ labheran vandanāya pūjanāya darśanāya vā sarve te Bhaiṣajyarājābhyāsannībhūtā veditavyā anuttarāyāḥ samyaksaṃbodheḥ.

Then again, Bhaiṣajyarāja, on which spot of earth this discourse on dharma would be declared or explained or written or is written in the form of a book, or would be recited or recited in chorus,

---

[33] H. Kern & B. Nanjio, Saddharma Puṇḍarīka [Biblio. Budd. X] (St. Petersburg: 1908-12); U. Wogihara & C. Tsuchida, Saddharma Puṇḍarīka-Sūtram: Romanized and Revised Text (Tokyo: 1958); N. Dutt, Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram: With N. D. Mironov's Readings from Central Asian Mss. (Calcutta: 1952); P. L. Vaidya, Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram [Budd. Skt. Texts 6] (Darbhanga: 1960); trans.: E. Burnouf, Le Lotus de la bonne Loi (Paris: 1852); H. Kern, Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or the Lotus of the Good Law [SBE, XXI] (Oxford: 1884). The translations given here are my own. Reference is, unless otherwise stated, to the Kern & Nanjio ed.

on that spot of earth, Bhaiṣajyarāja, a Tathāgata-caitya is to be made — great, consisting of jewels, high, lofty — and relics of the Tathāgata are not necessarily to be placed in it. What is the reason for that? Just in it the entire Tathāgata-relic is deposited.[34] On which spot of earth this discourse on dharma would be declared or explained or read or recited in chorus or written or where written in the form of a book it would stand, on that stūpa[35] veneration, honor by respect, worship and praise is to be made with all flowers and incense and perfumes and garlands and unguents and aromatic powders and cloth and umbrellas and banners and flags and streamers, with all songs and instrumental music and dancing and musical instruments and cymbals and singing and trilling together, worship is to be done. And again, Bhaiṣajyarāja, those beings who would get the opportunity to praise, to worship, or to see this Tathāgata-caitya, they all, Bhaiṣajyarāja, are to be known as having come near to excellent, complete and perfect enlightenment.

The second passage is:

SP (Kern & Nanjio) 340.3-8; (Wogihara & Tsuchida) 288.21-29; (Dutt) 233.15-20; (Vaidya) 202.21-26; Pek. Vol. 30 no. 781.60-5-7 & 8 (Burnouf trans.) 207; (Kern trans.) 324:

---

[34] Burnouf: "C'est que le corps du Tathāgata y est en quelque sorte contenu tout entier"; Kern: "For the body of the Tathāgata is, so to say collectively deposited there." Edgerton (BHSD 152[2]) gives as a definition of ekaghana: "'in one mass, entire', said of a Tathāgata's body which is not divided into separate relics"; cf. SP 240.11 and 259.15. For a similar usage in late Pali see Thūpavaṃsa, Ch. 2 where it occurs several times in the account of the relics of the previous Buddhas.

[35] This is clumsy English for 'tasmiṃś ca stūpe'; we kept this form to try to mark in English the parallelism between 'yasmin pṛthivīpradeśe . . .' and 'tasmiṃś ca stūpe'. Two of Kern's manuscripts read 'stūpasyaiva' for 'stūpe'; and he translates it thus: "Any spot of earth where this Dharmaparyāya is expounded or taught . . . must be honoured, respected . . . as if it were a stūpa."

Yasya kasyacid Ajita bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyemam dharmaparyāyam tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasya dhārayata ima evamrūpā guṇā bhaveyur ye mayā parikīrtitāḥ. So 'jita kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vaivam veditavyo bodhimaṇḍasamprasthito 'yam kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā bodhim abhisamboddhum bodhivṛkṣamūlam gacchati. Yatra cājita sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tiṣṭhed vā niṣīded vā caṅkramed vā tatrājita tathāgatam uddiśya caityam kartavyam [ma pham pa rigs kyi bu 'am rigs kyi bu mo de gaṅ na 'greṅ ṅam 'dug gam 'chag pa der ma pham pa de bźin gśegs pa'i phyir mchod rten brtsig go] tathāgatastūpo 'yam iti ca sa vaktavyaḥ sadevakena lokeneti.

And, Ajita, of whatsoever bodhisattva, mahāsattva, who preserves this discourse on dharma of a completely extinguished Tathāgata, these qualities, of such a sort as are announced by me, would become. He, Ajita, the son or daughter of good family, is thus to be known as having set out towards the terrace of enlightenment, this son or daughter of good family goes to the root of the bodhi-tree to completely awaken to enlightenment. And where, Ajita, he, the son or daughter of good family, would stand or sit or walk around, there, Ajita, in the name of the Tathāgata a caitya is to be made, and it is to be declared by the world together with its devas: "This is a stūpa of the Tathāgata".

And the corresponding gāthā version of this passage:

SP (Kern & Nanjio) 344.1-6 vv. 60-2; (Wogihara & Tsuchida) 290.28-291-10; (Dutt) 226.5-17; (Vaidya) 204.16-28; Pek. Vol. 30,

no. 781, 61-3-1; (Burnouf trans.) 209; (Kern trans.) 327:

Yasmiṃś ca so caṅkrami tādṛśo viduḥ / tiṣṭheta vā yatra niṣīdayed vā / śayyāṃ ca kalpeya kahiṃ ci dhīro / bhāṣantu gāthāṃ pi tu eka sūtrāt //60// Yasmiṃś ca stūpaṃ puruṣottamasya / kārāpayec citra sudarśanīyam / uddiśya buddhaṃ bhagavanta nāyakam / pūjāṃ ca citrāṃ tahi kārayet tathā //61// Mayā sa bhuktaḥ pṛthivīpradeśe / mayā svayaṃ caṅkramitaṃ ca tatra / tatropaviṣṭo aham eva ca syām / yatra sthitaḥ so bhavi buddhaputraḥ //62//

And on which [spot of earth] He, a holy sage, would walk around, or where he would sit or lie down, wherever the courageous would pronounce from this sūtra but one gāthā, //60// On that spot he would cause to make a stūpa of the best of men — excellent, beautiful — in the name of the Buddha, and he would thus do there excellent worship to the chief of the Blessed Ones. //61// He is possessed by me on that spot of earth,[36] and there I myself am walking around, and just there I would be where he, the son of the Buddha, is established. //62//

And finally:

SP (Kern & Nanjio) 391.6-13; (Wogihara & Tsuchida) 330.26-331.9; (Dutt) 262.3-11; (Vaidya) 231.1-7; Pek. Vol. 30, no. 781, 68-5-4; (Burnouf trans.) 236 (Kern trans.) 367:

Yasmiṃś ca kulaputrāḥ pṛthivīpradeśe 'yaṃ dharmaparyāyo vācyeta vā prakāśyeta vā deśyeta vā likhyeta vā cintyeta vā

---

[36] Or: 'It (i.e. the stūpa) is on that spot of earth possessed by me'. Burnouf: "J'ai certainement été en possession de l'endroit de la terre où s'est trouvé ce fils de Buddha."

bhāṣyeta vā svādhyāyeta vā pustakagato vā tiṣṭhed ārāme vā vihāre vā gṛhe vā vane vā nagare vā vṛkṣamūle vā prāsāde vā layane vā guhāyām vā, tasmin pṛthivīpradeśe tathāgatam uddiśya caityam kartavyam. [*sa phyogs der de bźin gśegs pa'i phyir mchod rten bya'o*] *Tat kasya hetor? Sarvatathāgatānāṃ hi sa pṛthivīpradeśo bodhimaṇḍo veditavyas tasmiṃś ca pṛthivīpradeśe sarvatathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhā anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbuddhā, iti veditavyaṃ, tasmiṃś ca pṛthivīpradeśe sarvatathāgatair dharmacakraṃ pravartitaṃ tasmiṃś ca pṛthivīpradeśe sarvatathāgatāḥ parinirvṛta iti veditavyam.*

And, sons of good family, on which spot of earth this discourse on dharma would be spoken or revealed or explained or written or thought of or declared or recited or where it would stand in the form of a book, whether in a park or a vihāra or in a house or forest or city or at the root of a tree or on a lofty platform or in a place of rest or a cave, on that spot of earth, in the name of a Tathāgata, a caitya is to be made. And what is the reason for that? It is because that spot of earth is to be known as the terrace of enlightenment of all Tathāgatas; and on that spot of earth all Tathāgatas, Arhats, Completely and Perfectly Enlightened Ones are completely awakened to the highest, complete and perfect enlightenment. Thus is it to be known. And on that spot of earth the wheel of dharma is caused to be set in motion by all Tathāgatas; and on that spot of earth all Tathāgatas are completely extinguished. Thus is it to be known.

That we are confronted in these three passages from the SP with yet further variants of the basic passage as found in the Vaj, AsP, etc., is beyond any real doubt. The similarities are too impressive. The vocabulary is, in the main, the same; the phraseology and syntax are the same. Even some of the elaborations of the SP versions have elements in common with the treatment of the passage at other places: both SP 340 and 391 and AsP 55-59 equate in some sense the pṛthivīpradeśa with the bodhimaṇḍa ('terrace of enlightenment'); Vaj 12 and SP 340 and 344 both say that where the man who preserves this text stands or sits, etc., the Tathāgata stands or sits. The most general difference between the handling of the passage in the Vaj, etc., and in the SP is in the prolixity of the latter, but this same prolixity is the most obvious characteristic of the style of the whole of the SP and is therefore not surprising. There are however, a few more significant differences. First, in none of the passages from the SP is the compound 'caityabhūta' used. Instead, we find only 'caitya', and there is what appears to be a conscious attempt to equate or assimilate this term to the word 'stūpa'. SP 340, for example says '. . . a caitya is to be made, and it is to be declared . . . this is a stūpa . . .". There is also a clear difference in the SP's choice of the main verb of the passage. Previously it was usually 'caityabhūtaḥ bhavati' ('it becomes caityabhūta'); in the SP it is always 'caityaṃ kartavyaṃ' ('a caitya is to be made'). The latter has much more the sense of a definite prescription. In connection with this it is perhaps noteworthy that 'caitya' in the SP passages is almost invariably qualified as not just a caitya, but as a 'tathagata-caitya'. In other words, the SP has a specific kind of caitya in mind and this same specificity probably accounts for the use of kartavya

(which could also mean 'to be built') as opposed to the more natural, less specific '<u>bhavati</u>'. Further, in the fact that the specific kind of <u>caitya</u> which is to be built is consciously equated with the <u>stūpa</u>, we are, perhaps, able to detect an attempted amalgamation of two distinct cults, the <u>stūpa</u> cult and the book cult. The situation may be summarized in the following way: the <u>SP</u> says that on that spot of earth where this discourse is spoken, etc., or on which, in the form of a book, it stands, a <u>Tathāgata-caitya</u> is to be made, and this <u>Tathāgata-caitya</u> is to be called a <u>Tathāgata-stūpa</u>. This new development in <u>SP</u> is clearly in the direction of synthesis; and our interpretation is perhaps finally confirmed by <u>SP</u> 231's unequivocal equation of the 'presence of the book' with the <u>ekaghanaṃ</u> <u>tathāgataśarīram</u>, 'the entire tathāgata-relic': where the <u>dharmaparyāya</u> is recited, set up, etc. ". . . a tathāgata caitya is to be caused to be made -- great, consisting of jewels, high, lofty -- and relics of the Tathāgata are not necessarily to be placed in it. What is the reason for that? Just in it the entire Tathāgata-relic is deposited."[37].

Perhaps at this point we should pause and summarize our findings. The first thing to be noted is that what we first conceived of as "parallels"

---

37 Although the situation tends to remain fluid, the final shape of the synthesis, with the cult of the book clearly having the upper-hand, is probably to be found in the following passages: <u>SP</u> 338.4ff: <u>tatas tathāgataṃ so 'ṃsena pariharati ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ pustakagataṃ kṛtvāṃsena pariharati</u>. <u>Na me tenājita kulaputreṇa vā kuladuhitrā vā stūpāḥ kartavyā na vihārāḥ kartavyā na bhikṣusaṃghāya glānapratyayabhaiṣajyapariṣkārās tenānupradeyā bhavanti</u>. <u>Tatkasya hetoḥ</u>. <u>Kṛtā me tenājita kulaputreṇa vā kuladuhitrā vā śarīreṣu śarīrapūjā saptaratnamayāś ca stūpāḥ kāritā</u> . . . and 339.6: <u>ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyam tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasya dhārayed vā vācayed vā deśayed va likhed vā lekhayed vā tad anenāham ajita paryāyeṇaivaṃ vadāmi</u>. <u>Na me tena parinirvṛtasya dhātustūpāḥ kārayitavya na saṃghapūjā</u>. For further comments on the synthesis going on in <u>SP</u> see below p. 54 n.60.

to *Vaj* 12 and 15c, turn out to be not "parallels" at all, at least not in any strict sense of the term. The various passages we have looked at represent — if we are to speak more accurately — the recurrence of a single basic formula. The formulaic character of the phrase *sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet* is by now well established: it occurs in almost the same basic form over a wide range of texts representative of a considerable variation in both age and style; it occurs in a basically stereotyped context; and finally, its independent status within the texts in which it is now found is evidenced by the peculiarity and consistency of its vocabulary, especially the peculiarity of the term *caitya*: in the entire corpus of the *Prajñāpāramitā* Literature, the only place the term *caitya* occurs is in our formula; the same observation holds for the *KP*, the *Ap*, the *Am*, and with one exception (*SP* 339.14, although this is not clearly an exception, for it occurs in very close contact with our formula) for the *SP*. In some cases, as in the *Ap* (cf. p. 21), it is even clear that our formula represents an obvious interpolation. In addition to this and the second point to be noted, is that our formula belongs undeniably to the cult of the book, and, judging from the study of our formula, this cult went through at least two distinct phases distinguished from one another by whether the role of the book was defined primarily in terms of an oral tradition (*Vaj* 12 and 15c; *KP* 160; and perhaps *SP* 340.3-8), or a written tradition (*AsP*, *SP*, *Ap*). Not only this, but the larger passages in which the formula occurs supply us in addition with a good deal of general information on this cult, and this, in turn, if we desire a better understanding of our formula, must be summarized.

It is unfortunate that in spite of its significant presence in a rather large number of Mahāyāna texts, there has been no substantial work on the cult of the book. There are at best only scattered and incidental references.[38] Although tempted, we will not attempt to meet the need for such a study here. Rather, we will limit ourselves to an attempt to reconstruct, on the basis of our texts, something of the historical situation of the cult and something of its basic organizational structure. Since our interest is largely "structural" and "historical" we will by and large -- though not completely -- set aside for another time the rich material contained in our texts on the ideology or theology underlying the cult.

Since by far and away the most elaborate discussion of the cult is to be found in the AsP, it is this discussion which will form the basis of our own.

The first point which emerges from a study of the cult of the book in the AsP, SP and in our other sources is that this cult did not develop in isolation. It had to contend at every step with the historical priority and the dominance of the stūpa/relic cult of early Buddhism in the milieu in which it was attempting to establish itself. This had a pronounced affect on the development of its organizational structure, as well as on the form which its ideological justifications took. The discussion at AsP 59-60, on the general unawareness of the men of Jambudvīpa as concerns the superior value of the prajñāpāramitā-pūjā, rather unambiguously reflects the "minority" status of the cult of the book: kiṃ nu te bhagavan

---

[38] L. de La Vallée Poussin, Bouddhisme: Études et matériaux (London: 1898) 186,201,227; L. Renou et J. Filliozat, L'Inde classique, T, II (Paris: 1953) 607-08; Lamotte, "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna", Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller (Leipzig: 1954) 393-96; Nandasena Mudiyanse, Mahāyāna Monuments in Ceylon (Colombo: 1967) 91-92; etc.

na vetsyanti evaṃ mahānuśaṃsā evaṃ mahāphalā evaṃ mahāvipākā bhagavatoktā prajñāpāramitāyāḥ pūjā kṛtā bhaviṣyatīti? Na ca te vedayiṣyanti, uta jñāsyanti vetsyanti, vedayiṣyanti, na ca punaḥ śraddhāsyanti? At AsP 71.5ff and 94.13ff, the justification of the cult of the book is articulated not in terms of its own inherent value, but in terms of its value relative to the stūpa/relic cult: prajñāpāramitānirjātā hi Kauśika tathāgatānām arhatāṃ samyaksaṃbuddhānāṃ sarvajñatā. Sarvajñatānirjātā ca tathāgataśarīrānāṃ pūjā, etc. At KP 158-59, Vkn XII,4-6, etc., the merit derived from the cult of the book is always expressed in terms of its comparative superiority to that derived from the stūpa/relic cult. These passages and others like them are indicative of a confrontation of the two cults or, at the least, a situation of competition between them; and this situation is not surprising when it is kept in mind that the compilers of the AsP, etc. were attempting to introduce a radical innovation in the face of an established cult form of central importance[39] which, in addition, had the sanction of the dominant sector of the Buddhist community.[40] The

---

[39] The most recent statement on the position of the stūpa/relic cult in early Buddhism, and one which goes a long way towards re-establishing a reasonable perspective on the matter, is D. L. Snellgrove, "Śākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa", Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 36 (1973) 409-11.

[40] This is an important point here, as in any discussion of the development of the form and content of Mahāyāna. The situation is well summarized by A. K. Warder [Indian Buddhism (Delhi: 1970) 374]: ". . . the available evidence shows that the majority of Buddhists in India at all times have followed the early schools and the Mahāyāna there was always a minority movement." For the 'demography' of Buddhism in India see A. Bareau, et al, Les religions de l'Inde, III (Paris: 1966) 148-50; É. Lamotte, Histoire, 596-606 [his figures, p. 601, on the relative numbers of 'Hīnayāna' as opposed to 'Mahāyāna' differ from Bareau's primarily because of his interpretation of the designation "Mahāyāna-Sthavira", on which see further Lin Li-Kouang, L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi (Paris: 1949) 208-10]; É. Lamotte, "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna", 393-96; Tāranātha's History of Buddhism, trans. L. Chimpa & A. Chattopadhyaya (Simla: 1970) 95; 100; 161; Biography of Dharmasvāmin, trans. G. Roerich (Patna: 1959) 87.

texts here under review exhibit two distinct patterns of coming to terms with the dominance of the stūpa/relic cult. One, represented by the AsP, attempted to formulate a set of arguments which could establish on doctrinal grounds that the cult of relics was in fact an inferior form of the cult of the book. This pattern is observable in the citation above from AsP 71.5ff, and at AsP 58.5-59.6; 94.1-96.11; 99.3-20, etc. It is also this pattern which is found in all the passages dealing with the superiority of the merit derived from the cult of the book (KP 158-59; etc.). The other pattern, represented by the SP, asserted an equivalence between the two cults wherein each had a relatively equal status or value. The passages exhibiting this pattern (SP 231.7-232.5; 338.4ff; 339.6ff) have already been cited above and the pattern discussed (cf. pp.26ff). All things considered, it appears that the first pattern described here is also the oldest. All of the texts which we have considered, except the SP, belong to this group; and two of them, the AsP and the KP, are undoubtedly earlier than the SP. On the other hand, the SP pattern, though later, had the great advantage of being able to invoke the equivalency of the dharmaparyāya with a Tathāgata's relics in legitimating both its cult and its cultic centers. The earlier AsP pattern, by its critical attitude towards the stūpa/relic cult, found itself in a position where it was unable, unlike the SP, to take advantage of the established and authoritative tradition supporting the older cult. This, as might be expected, created some problems of legitimacy and it is perhaps this same critical attitude which accounts for the use of the term caitya -- otherwise so rare in these texts -- in our formula.

When we turn to the structure of the cult, however, it is evident

that in spite of this competition or, more probably, because of it, the form of the cult of the book was closely patterned on the form in which its rival cult was organized. It is clear from the passage cited from the AsP, as it is from all evidence on the matter,[41] that the relic cult had a clearly defined organizational center; i.e., the stūpa. It was around the stūpa that the activity of the worshipper turned and it was the erection of such a structure which allowed a stable localization of the cult.[42] It is equally clear from the AsP, etc. that the organizational center of the cult of the book was first of all the book and, by extension, the pṛthivīpradeśa where the book was recited, set-up or circulated. It should be noted, for example, that in all occurrences of our formula it is the pṛthivīpradeśa in itself and not the book which becomes caityabhūta and is to be worshipped, etc. There is a tendency here, as well as in the relic cult,[43] for the 'container' of the sacred object (the stūpa as 'containing' the relics; the pṛthivīpradeśa as in some sense containing the 'book') to become the focus of the cult, rather than the sacred object itself. This was probably much more the case for the earliest or oral tradition period of the book cult where a definite material object around which the activity of the cult could be centered was absent. Apart, however, from the difference in focal point, the texts describe the structure of the two cults in exactly the same terms (cf. AsP 57.5-15, cited above in Conze's trans.): placing the relics in a stūpa; honoring, revering them, etc., with

---

[41] See, for example, A. Bareau, "La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les vinayapiṭaka", Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 50 (1962) 229-94.

[42] The tradition concerning Trapuṣa and Bhallika and the stūpas they erected in their home country illustrates this last point; see Lamotte, Histoire, 72n.2 & 3 for references.

[43] Bareau, "La construction et le culte", pp. 268-69.

flowers, incense, rows of lamps; writing the dharmaparyāya and making it into a book, setting it up; honoring, revering it with flowers, incense, rows of lamps. It seems obvious, then, that the cult of the book was in structure patterned closely on the structure of the earlier relic cult or, expressed differently, that the former took over from the latter the prescribed forms of activity while at the same time substituting a distinctly different object toward which they were directed. However, the early architects of the cult of the book, by adopting the structure of the established cult which surrounded them, committed themselves to a pattern which required at least one very important thing for continued organizational development: localization. This again presented problems of legitimation.

It appears that the stūpa/relic cult had from its inception not only authoritative sanction in the form of undisputed Buddhavacana, but also clearly delimited geographic localization.[44] The latter, of course, slowly expanded, as did the 'historical-legendary' tradition which supported it, and as long as the one kept pace with the other, which appears to have happened,[45] there was no serious problem of the legitimacy of the cultic centers or of discontinuity of the line back to the Buddha himself. This was not the case with the cult of the book. It had neither undisputed or unambiguous normative sanction,[46] nor any geographic connection. The attempts at achieving

[44]The locus classicus for both is, as is well known, the Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra and its parallel passages elsewhere; cf. E. Waldschmidt, Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, Teil III (Berlin: 1951) 358ff. and 432ff; Snellgrove, "Śākyamuni's Final Nirvāṇa", 409-11.

[45]Cf. J. Przyluski, "Le partage des reliques du buddha", Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 4 (1935-36) 341-67.

[46]Canonical Pali, for example, makes no reference whatever to book worship and its reference just to books is rare, cf. Dīgha (PTS) iii 94; Jātaka (Fausböll) i2, iii 235, 292, iv 299, 487, the most interesting is Jātaka iv 299. There is, however, one text which, if we were looking for the "beginnings" of the book cult in Pali Buddhism, might do service. This is the odd little text entitled Gāravo found at Saṃyutta (PTS) i 138-40 where the Buddha is made to say yaṃ nūnāhaṃ yvāyaṃ dhammo mayā abhisambuddho tam eva dhammaṃ sakkatvā garukatvā upanissāya vihareyyan ti. And Brahmā encourages

normative sanction (probably never undisputed) are preserved in the arguments of the AsP, Vkn, etc. and form the formal ideological foundations of the cult. They must be explored at another time. The attempt at geographic localization must be dealt with here.

In approaching the problem of localization in the cult of the book, we are hampered, if by nothing else, by the scarcity of information bearing on the subject. Practically the only clear reference to the matter is to be found in our formula and in the immediate contexts in which our formula is found.[47] A possible explanation for this scarcity is that our formula represents an early standardization of a solution to the problem which, being formalized, rendered unnecessary any further or prolonged discussion of the matter. This explanation gains, perhaps, some plausibility when one understands the incredible richness of meaning which is compacted into our formula and its immediate contexts. However this may be, if we want to know anything about the way in which the places where the cult took place were conceived of, we must look primarily to our formula.

Our formula and its contexts brim over with a complex interweaving of allusions which, with much labor and more than a little uncertainty, must be untangled if we are to understand what our formula is saying. First of all it is clear, as we have indicated above, that the compilers of the majority of our texts (with the particular exception of the SP), by their critical attitude towards the stūpa/relic cult, cut themselves off from access to the tradition which supported that cult. There remained,

---

him, saying all Buddhas past, present, have done just that. Outside of the canonical Pali sources, there appears to be a reference to book worship -- connected here with the "Mahāyāna" -- in the Cūlavaṃsa, (cf. W. Geiger, Cūlavaṃsa, pt. I (London: 1929) 55 & n.2; S. Paranavitane "Mahāyānism in Ceylon", Ceylon Journal of Science 2 (1928) 37-38.

[47] For AsP some additional information may be found at 56, 57, 77, 85, 88, 89, etc. and esp. 506; all of it is supportive of the point we wish to make.

however, one other tradition relating to sacred spots in early Buddhism which was still available to them and on which they could draw. It is in this regard that it is not incidental — and certainly not accidental — that at AsP 56.6ff, the protective power of the place where the Prajñāpāramitā is taken up, taught, etc. is equated (tadyathāpi nāma . . . evam eva) with the protective power of the bodhimaṇḍa, perhaps the most prominent of the four mahācaityas of the older tradition (cf. below). The cause of the power of the first (tatkasya hetoḥ), is that past, present and future Buddhas awaken to perfect enlightenment there. The cause for the power of the second is that by the presence of the Prajñāpāramitā it is made caitya-bhūta. A set of passages from the Vaj repeats the allusion to the connection between the bodhimaṇḍa which is a mahācaitya and the pṛthivīpradeśa which is caityabhūta, albeit in a less obvious form, and accounts for what appears in the AsP to be a case of having the same effect (equal protective power) from two different causes (the presence of the enlightenment experience and the presence of the Prajñāpāramitā). Vaj 8 says that if someone, having taken from this dharmaparyāya (i.e. the Prajñāpāramitā) even one gāthā having four lines, would demonstrate and illuminate it in full detail for others, he would get far greater merit than one who would give a great number of gifts to a Tathāgata. The reason for this (tatkasya hetoḥ) is that from it (i.e. the dharmaparyāya=the Prajñāpāramitā) comes the perfect enlightenment of Tathāgatas, from it come the Buddhas, the Blessed Ones (ato nirjātā hi Subhūte tathāgatānām arhatām samyaksambuddhānām anuttarā samyaksambodhir, etc. See also AsP 58 & 463). Vaj 12, on the other hand, using almost the same words, says that where this takes place, where someone, having taken from this dharmaparyāya, etc., would teach or illuminate

it (i.e. make present the source of enlightenment=this dharmaparyāya), that spot of earth would be caityabhūta. Though less explicit, the connection here between the enlightenment experience and the spot which is caityabhūta is nevertheless undeniable. In addition, we can now in the light of these Vaj passages and AsP 58 & 463 re-read AsP 56.6ff: the bodhimaṇḍa (which is a mahācaitya) has great protective power because it is associated with the enlightenment experience; the pṛthivīpradeśa which is caityabhūta has great protective power because it too is associated with the enlightenment experience by the fact that the Prajñāpāramitā, which is the source of that experience, is present. If the articulation of the connection here is subtle, this cannot equally be said of its articulation at SP 391. The latter says that on the spot of earth where the dharmaparyāya is spoken, written, etc., a Tathāgata-caitya is to be made (here, the only place in the SP where our formula occurs without reference to 'stūpa', tathāgatam uddiśya caityaṃ kartavyam can almost be understood as a gloss for caityabhūta). The reason for this (tatkasya hetoḥ) is unequivocal: 'that spot of earth is to be known (veditavya) as the bodhimaṇḍa of all Tathāgatas; here they obtain perfect enlightenment, turn the wheel of dharma, enter into parinirvāṇa (the sites of the last two activities are, of course, two more of the four mahācaityas).[48] All three texts present in some way the linkage of the pṛthivīpradeśa which is caityabhūta with the bodhimaṇḍa or, less often, some other of the mahācaityas,

---

48 For some interesting remarks on this passage and on both the "sens propre" and the "sens figuré" of bodhimaṇḍa see Lamotte, Vimalakīrti, 198n.105 and Lamotte, La concentration de la marche héroïque (Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra), Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 13 (1965) 221n.242. Even though it does not contain our precise formula, it is still perhaps worthwhile to cite Lamotte's translation of the passage in the Śūraṃ. which inspired his note: "Ānanda, l'endroit où j'ai atteint l'anuttarasaṃyaksaṃbodhi c'est le [Siège] de diamant (vajrāsana) où les Buddha passés (atīta), futurs (anāgata) et présents

and, as such, tie these new spots into the old tradition concerning places of pilgrimage. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that all three texts, in articulating this linkage, have only elaborated or made explicit what was, perhaps, already present in the very vocabulary with which our formula was constructed.

It is again not incidental that the word for 'place' or 'location' in our formula is 'pṛthivīpradeśa'. It is just this word which the first Avalokita Sūtra of the Mahāvastu constantly uses instead of the more usual 'bodhimaṇḍa' to refer to the site of the great awakening. Not only that, but the same text gives a list of 16 characteristics of the pṛthivīpradeśa, the last of which Jones translates as "And, monks, all who are universal kings decide upon that place and no other for a monument" (ye pi te bhikṣavo rājāno cakravartino taṃ pṛthivīpradeśaṃ adhisthihanti nānyatra cetiyārtham).[49] In addition to this Mahāvastu passage, however, and of greater significance, is the fact that the primary text source underlying the whole of the earlier tradition of pilgrimage and its sacred spots, uses, in its Sanskrit version exactly the same term.

(pratyutpanna) arrivent à la grande illumination (abhisaṃbodhi). Eh bien, tous les lieux où l'on prêche le Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra sont absolument identiques (sama, nirviśeṣa) à ce Siège de diamant. De même aussi tous les lieux où le Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra est prêché (deśita), récité (vācita) ou écrit (likhita)." This is obviously very close to both our formula and to the passages we have been discussing.

[49] É. Senart, Le Mahāvastu, T. II (Paris: 1890) 263; R. Basak, Mahāvastu Avadāna, Vol. II (Calcutta: 1964) 364; J. J. Jones, The Mahāvastu, Vol. II [SBB. 18] (London: 1952) 248. Jones (p. 248n.4) cites Senart's "interpretation" of the sentence: "ne se reposent pas en ce lieu si ce n'est pour venir l'adorer". Edgerton (BHSD, 233[1]) understands it in yet another different way: "for the purpose of (making it, viz. the spot where Buddha became enlightened) an object of veneration (universal emperors will never master, adhisthihanti with v.l., that spot except for this purpose.)"

catvārā ime bhikṣavaḥ pṛthivīpradeśāḥ (*sa phyogs*; Pāli: *ṭhāna*) *śrāddhasya kulaputrasya kuladuhitur vā yāvajjīvam anusmaraṇīyā bhavanti*. *Katame catvāraḥ*. *Iha bhagavān jātaḥ*. *Iha bhagavān anuttarām samyaksambodhim abhisaṃbuddhaḥ*. *Iha bhagavatā triparivartaṃ dvādaśākāraṃ dhārmyaṃ dharmacakraṃ pravartitam*. *Iha bhagavān anupadhiśeṣe nirvāṇadhātau parinirvṛtaḥ*. *Āgamiṣyanti bhikṣavo mamātyayāc caityaparicārakāś caityavandakās* (*mchod rten bskor ba dan mchod rten la phyag 'tshal ba*) *ta evaṃ vakṣyanti*. *Iha bhagavān jātaḥ*, etc... *atrāntarā ye kecit prasannacittā mamāntike kālam kariṣyanti te sarve svargopagā ye kecit sopadhiśeṣāḥ*.

O Bhikṣus, these four spots of earth are to be remembered for as long as is the life of a believing son or daughter of good family. What four? Here the Blessed One was born; here the Blessed One completely and perfectly awakened to the utmost, right and perfect enlightenment; here by the Blessed One was turned the Holy Wheel of dharma having three turnings and twelve forms; here the Blessed One entered into the realm of Nirvāṇa having no remainder. O Bhikṣus, after my passing away, they, attending to caityas, worshipping caityas, will come; they will say thus: Here the Blessed One was born, etc...whoever in these places, having purified thought in the presence of me, will die, they all, whichever are with remainder, are fit for heaven.[50]

---

[50] Waldschmidt, *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Teil III, 388-90; cf. N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, pt. 2, 113. A. Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha dans les Sūtrapiṭaka et les Vinayapiṭaka anciens*, Vol. II: *Les derniers mois, le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles* (Paris: 1971) 29-32; S. Levi, "Une poésie inconnue du roi Harṣa Śīlāditya", *Actes du Xe Congrès international des orientalistes*, Vol. II (Leiden: 1895) 189-203; P.C. Bagchi, "The Eight Great Caityas and Their Cult", *Indian Historical Quarterly* 17 (1941) 223-35; Agehananda Bharati, "Pilgrimage in the Indian Tradition", *History of Religions* 3(1963) 152-59.

In light of this text, a text which undoubtedly would have been well known within cultic circles, it is clear that the maker of our formula, by simply using the term pṛthivīpradeśa to indicate the place where the dharmaparyāya was, had already in some sense implicitly connected it with the tradition relating to caityas, with the bodhimaṇḍa, etc.

Woven into and around this set of allusions is another distinct, though closely related set. Vaj 12 says that on that spot which is caityabhūta and on which a gāthā of four lines from this dharmaparyāya is taught, etc., on that spot either the Teacher dwells or a wise guru (vijñaguru) representing him. SP 344, says that where a holy sage (tādṛśo viduḥ) teaches a gāthā of four lines from this sūtra, and where because of this, a stūpa is to be made, he, the sage, is there 'possessed' by the Buddha and there the Buddha himself is.[51] Again, KP 160 expresses a similar notion: Just as (tadyathāpi nāma) one reveres the Tathāgata, so too one is to revere him who takes up, etc. this dharmaparyāya on that spot which is caityabhūta (lit. dharmabhāṇakasyānt[ikā]d [Weller, Zum Kāśyapa. 159n.8]). In all of these there is an equation of the presence of the dharmaparyāya with the presence of the Buddha. This, of course, links up with both the old conception expressed in such phrases as yo dhammaṃ passati so Bhagavantaṃ passati[52] and the conception of the Dharmakāya as 'the body of teachings'. Without wishing to enter on a long discussion of the latter, it should at least be noted that AsP 94 has recourse to this conception of the Dharmakāya as a part of its argument in support of the cult of the book:

---

[51]Although the question is far from settled there is some indication that the SP was 'influenced' by the Vaj. Our passage may or may not be a case in point; see Kazuyoshi Kino, "On the Influence of the Vajracchedikā upon the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka", Indogaku Bukkyōgākū Kenkyū 10 (1962) 380–78.

[52]Milinda-Pañho (PTS) 71; Majjhima Nikāya (PTS) i190–91; Itivuttaka (PTS) 91; Saṃyutta Nikāya (PTS) iii 120; Śālistambasūtra (Sastri. ed. see n.9) 1.7; Āryapratītyasamutpāda-sūtra (ibid.) 26.7, etc.

etad [a written copy of the Prajñāpāramitā] dhi tathāgatānām bhūtārthikam śarīram. Tatkasya hetoḥ. Uktam hy etad bhagavatā: dharmakāyā buddhā bhagavantaḥ (cf. AsP 99, 338, 462, 513). However this may be, it is evident that all three passages assert the presence, in some sense, of the Buddha on the spot where the dharmaparyāya is or is recited, etc. This in itself would be quite enough to render that spot sacred, to make it a powerful caitya. But there are perhaps even further allusions embedded in our formula.

As we have seen above in the long passage quoted from the AsP, the pṛthivīpradeśa is not the only thing which is caityabhūto vandanīyaḥ, etc. According to this passage the ātmabhāvaśarīra — which Conze translates as "physical personality" — of the Buddha, from its being the support of the knowing of all-knowledge (sarvajñajñānāśrayabhūtvāt) is also caityabhūto vandanīyaḥ, etc. Whatever the exact meaning of ātmabhāvaśarīra, it is clear that it refers at least to the body or physical presence of the Buddha.[53] Again, it is not only here that this idea is found. Lalitavistara (=LV) ch.23, v.63 seems to express a similar notion where, when the earth-devas are euologizing the bodhimaṇḍa, it says:

lābha iha sulabdhā bhumidevair udārā
yatra paramasattvaś caṃkramī medinīye
yattaku raju loke sarva obhāsitās te
ceti bhu trisahasraḥ kiṃ punas tubhya kāyaḥ
['jig rten rdul rnams ji sñed khyod kyis snañ bar mdzad

---

53 For discussions of the term ātmabhāva see Edgerton, BHSD 92[1]; Conze, Vajrac. Prajñā [SOR XIII] 110, and J. W. de Jong's review of the latter in Indo-Iranian Journal 4 (1960) 75n.3.

stoṅ gsum mchod rten gyur na khyod sku smos ci 'tshal][54]

Loosely translated this seems to say:

Here is well gained by the earth devas the best gaining,

[here] where the highest being walked on the earth.

As many as are all the particles of dust in the world illuminated by you,

[there this] three-thousand-fold world has become a caitya, how much more so your body.

Alongside of these passages and closely related to them, we find in both the LV and the Mahāvastu a set of related epithets, all applied to the Buddha, all but one occurring in contexts in which the act of enlightenment or the bodhimaṇḍa is the primary topic: at Mhv (Senart) ii 349, 359, iii 273 the Buddha is referred to as sarvalokasya cetiyo; at Mhv ii 294,354, iii 279, LV ch. 7, v.47, ch. 23, v.31 as lokasya cetiya or lokacetiya; at Mhv

[54] P. L. Vaidya, Lalitavistara [Budd. Skt. Texts 1] (Darbhanga: 1958) 268.14-17; Pek. Vol. 27 no. 763, 234-2-4. I have, at the suggestion of Prof. de Jong, emended the reading yatra ku as found in Vaidya to yattaku (= ji sñed); and because I myself am uncertain of the Skt., and because the Tib. does not agree perfectly with any of the other translations of caityabhūta as a compound, I follow Edgerton (BHSD) 232^{2}-233^{1} in taking ceti bhu as two words, with bhu = abhūt. A direct relationship to our compound, however, seems obvious. Apart from these two passages, the only other place I have found caityabhūta outside of our formula is at Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra (D. T. Suzuki & H. Idzumi, Kyoto: 1936) 494.1ff (P. L. Vaidya [Budd. Skt. Texts 5] Darbhanga: 1960) 396.17ff, which is also quoted at Śikṣāsamuccaya (C. Bendall, St. Petersburg: 1902) 5.20-6.8: bodhicittaṃ hi kulaputra bījabhūtaṃ sarva-buddhadharmāṇām; kṣetrabhūtaṃ sarvajagacchukladharmavirohanatayā . . . caityabhūtaṃ sadevamānuṣāsurasya lokasya [rigs kyi bu byaṅ chub kyi sems ni saṅs rgyas kyi chos thams cad kyi sa bon lta bu'o,'gro ba thams cad kyi chos dkar po rnam par 'phel bar byed pas źiṅ lta bu'o . . . lha daṅ mi daṅ lha ma yin du bcas pa'i 'jig rten rnams la mchod rten lta bu'o, Pek. Vol. 26, no. 761, 301-3-6ff.] Caityabhūta here -- in a context altogether different from our formula -- appears to be used in a metaphoric or simiIetic sense. We might also cite here the only passage (that we have found) in Pali literature in which cetiya is used in a similar sense. It occurs in the very last line of the Milinda Pañho (V. Trenckner [PTS] London: 1880, 1962; p. 420.21-22): tasmā hi paṇḍito poso sampassaṃ atthamattano / paññāvantābhipūjeyya, cetiyaṃ viya pūjiyan-ti.

ii 296 as cetiyam narānām.[55] All of these passages coalesce to show that there was a loose tradition in which the Buddha himself was conceived of as a caitya, if not the caitya par excellence.

We of course cannot prove that the maker of our formula consciously intended to invoke all these allusions, although they were probably available to him. The point here is that the compilers of our texts, by placing the formula in the specific contexts we have surveyed, have given us a fairly clear idea of how they understood the formula and what they intended it to mean. This is especially clear in reference to the compound caityabhūta. It is very difficult to believe that a place which was equal in 'power' to the power of the bodhimanda (AsP 55ff; SP 391) was thought of as only like a caitya.[56] It is difficult to believe that the place where an activity which produced immense quantities of merit — quantities vastly superior to those attached to the 'worship' of stūpas and relics -- was undertaken (Vaj 15, KP 160), was thought of as only like a caitya; that a place at which the Buddha himself was powerfully present (Vaj 12, SP 344), that was to be worshipped and circumambulated not only by men, but by gods and asuras (Vaj 15c), that Īśvaras, Mahā-Īśvaras, and Brahmās not only considered as the foremost of places, but actually took for their dwelling place (Am), and finally, that had deposited on it not a mere relic, but the 'entire Tathagata-relic'

---

[55] Of these passages all but Mhv. ii 354 and iii 279 are also cited by Edgerton (BHSD, 233[1]). For what appears to be a similar expression in late Pali, see Thūpavamsa (N. A. Jayawickrama [SBB] London: 1971) 174 where cetiyaṭṭhana as an epithet applied to the Buddha occurs. It is interesting to note that Thāna, the final member of the compound here, is the same word as is used for 'place' in the Pali version of the passage on the four 'places' of pilgrimage cited above.

[56] There is an implied recognition of this in Conze's translation of caityabhūta here as "a true shrine". Yet in spite of the overwhelming presence of the context, de la Vallée Poussin (L'abhidharmakośa de Vasubandu, quatrième chap. (Louvain: 1924) p. 245n.) was able to understand the same passage as meaning: "Le lieu où la Prajñāpāramitā est enseignée devient semblable à un caitya."

(SP 231) — it is extremely difficult to maintain that such a place was thought of as like a caitya. Our contexts leave no doubt as to how the tradition understood the term caityabhūta: the pṛthivīpradeśa was not like a caitya, nor was it just a caitya. The bulk of the Tibetan translations, mchod rten du 'gyur ro, etc., and translations such as Weller's "ein Heiligtum geworden", seem to take little, if any, account of the -bhūta. If for example, we had only the Tibetan documents and wanted to reconstruct on the basis of them the Sanskrit original, the most we could legitimately get out of them would be caityaṃ bhavati, bhavet, etc. But the persistence with which the form caityabhūta is maintained is a definite indication that something more than, at least different from, just caitya, was intended. It could of course be said that -bhūta here functions only to turn 'an appositional substantive into an adjective' or that it is "une finale °bhūta explétive". Such statements, unfortunately, describe only its grammatical function, while ignoring — perhaps suppressing — a possibly significant lexical meaning. As we have seen from a study of the contexts in which our formula is found, the pṛthivīpradeśa which becomes caityabhūta is equated with not just a caitya, but with, above all, the bodhimaṇḍa; that is to say with a, if not the, mahā-caitya. Regardless, then, of how it is grammatically described, it would seem necessary to see -bhūta here as supplying a meaning somewhat analagous to that supplied by mahā- in mahā-caitya. As we have seen above, this is, perhaps, supported by the substitution of caityasammata for caityabhūta which occurs in the Am. If we take -bhūta as an expletive of emphasis carrying 'meanings' more or less close to mahā-, then we can understand the term caityabhūta as indicating, if we adapt Edgerton's translation (above p. 6) and maintain in English the adjectival function, "having

emphatically the nature of a sacred place" or "having eminently the nature of a sacred place"; if, on the other hand we make it in English a predicate nominative, we may read: 'it becomes (bhavati) "an eminent sacred place"'; or again, sticking closer to the literal meaning of -bhūta: 'it becomes a true, a real, a proper sacred place (as opposed to what was previously taken or conceived of as a sacred place, as opposed to an "ordinary sacred place")'. Both 'mahā-caitya' and 'caitya-bhūta' express a distinction of superiority of degree or quality between a thing so designated, and a thing designated simply 'caitya'.[57] The assertion of superiority implied in the use of -bhūta, as well as to some degree the implied time sense of the

---

[57] Perhaps it is worthwhile to cite from Conze's dictionary (Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature, Tokyo: 1967) a number of examples where -bhūta has the same meaning and function as we give it here: MDPPL,92: asaṅgabhūta - "true non-attachment"; MDPPL,190: tīrthibhūta - "true ford"; MDPPL,306: bhājanī-bhūta - "one who has become a fit vessel"; ibid., bhājana (-bhūta) from AsP 94: bhājanabhūtāny abhūvan, which is except for tense, etc. the same as Renou's bhājanabhūtā bhavanti. Conze translates AsP 94 (not in diction. See his trans., p. 37): "They are the true repositories . . .", while Renou, in contrast, has simply, "ils deviennent des vases" (cf. p.5). Perhaps these few examples (there are many more) will suffice to show that this usage of -bhūta is attestable in spite of the fact that the standard grammars do not recognize it. Here also we might say a word or two about Conze's treatment of the compound caityabhūta both in his dictionary and in his translations. His treatment in his dictionary is very puzzling; under caitya he cites Vaj 12 and 15c and gives as the translation "shrine". But the form at Vaj 12 and 15c is caityabhūta (caitya alone never occurs in the Prajñāpāramitā Lit.) and his published translations of it are always "like a shrine". The next entry in the dictionary is caityabhūta, citing AsP 57-8 and translated -- as in the trans. of the AsP -- by a "true shrine". He does not mention under either entry the occurrence of the compound or its Tibetan equivalent at Adh. 32.10 which he had translated in 1965 as "like a true shrine". Chronologically the AsP trans. "a true shrine" is earliest (completed in 1951, though published in 1958) and his trans. in the Vaj (1958) seems to reject the earlier trans. (the reasons for such a change escape me; certainly it cannot be based on a difference in context); in spite of this, his dictionary (1967) retains the trans. in the AsP passages and camouflages the occurrence of the compound in the Vaj. The final result of all this is a rather complicated case of confusion.

participle, is, in addition, to be partially understood in reference to the historical context: the emphasis expressed by the -bhūta was necessary in the face of an attempt to call a thing (the pṛthivīpradeśa) a caitya which previously had not received that designation. The innovation required the emphasis.[58] Finally, however we choose to translate this emphasis, our investigation of the contexts makes it more than definite that the similetic interpretation must be given up.

Perhaps we are now in a position to appreciate not only the sense of our formula, but also its function as one solution to the problem of localization in the cult of the book. The solution appears to be based on two sets of earlier ideas: first the idea expressed in the old formulas yo dhammaṃ passati so bhagavantaṃ passati, etc.; and second, the idea that the presence of the Buddha at a particular place, especially at the time of significant events in his life such as his enlightenment, rendered that place sacred. The maker or users of our formula adapted the first idea by making dhamma explicitly equal to dharmaparyāya, and thus set up the further equation dharmaparyāya=bhagavat (AsP). Given this equation, it followed naturally that if the presence of the Bhagavat at a particular place had the effect of sacralizing that spot, then by extension, the presence (in some form) of the dharmaparyāya must have the same effect. This conception was buttressed by adaptations of the second; if the dharmaparyāya was the source of the enlightenment (AsP, Vaj), then its presence at any particular spot rendered, by extension, that spot equal to the bodhimaṇḍa, the traditional "source" of enlightenment. Thus the two older ideas are adapted, extended and finally fused. This adaptation, extension and final fusion was carefully and consciously articulated in the vocabulary of one of the earlier traditions concerning sacred spots: the use of the terms caitya, pṛthivīpradeśa, etc. in the articulation of these notions

---

[58] This aspect is particularly clear in Haribhadra's comments on AsP 57, see U. Wogihara, Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā, 205.13-212.12.

clearly links them with the traditions centered on the four or eight mahācaityas, as do the allusions and equations to the bodhimaṇḍa, etc. In light of this and our whole discussion, we may see in the phrase sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet the formulaic expression of this whole complex of ideas. Once this formula was worked out and accepted, it could then be inserted into the text which one recited and wished to establish, and then the recitation, etc., of that text at a particular spot, on the basis of the associations asserted in the formula, would have, in effect, the effect of authoritatively legitimating that spot as a cultic center. Such a formula would have provided a useful mechanism for the expansion and development of new centers. It was both grounded in tradition (i.e. it was -- once it was inserted into the texts -- buddhavacana) and yet allowed for the institution of centers other than those already sanctioned by the more or less fixed historical-legendary tradition.

If given our reconstruction of the use of the formula, we are, perhaps, also able to account for the observable shift, noted earlier, from an orientation emphasizing the oral tradition to one primarily emphasizing a written tradition. In the former case the development and maintenance of new cultic centers would depend on the periodic visits of wandering bhāṇakas or reciters. This was, at best, an unstable mechanism. If centers were to be established which would have a more permanent character and which would, by that fact, make possible the development of a cult in a more truly sociological sense of the term, it was necessary to have a more permanent, more specific object to serve as the focal point of the cult. The shift to a primarily written tradition is perhaps to be accounted for by this need. Once the book was in written form, it could be deposited permanently at the places

where the bhāṇakas were in the habit of teaching and reciting and thus, even in the absence of the bhāṇakas, it would provide a permanently located source of power.

Finally, the results of our cursory review of a small number of Mahāyāna Sūtras undertaken to more clearly understand the background of the sa pṛthivī-pradeśa formula, have, in addition, produced some interesting implications for A. Hirakawa's theory on the origin of Mahāyāna.[59] We cannot here trace his arguments in detail, and note only that to his initial question, "What, then, constituted the institutional basis from which Mahāyāna Buddhism arose? (p. 85)", he answers: "From my studies of this problem I have reached the conclusion that it was the stūpa which was the religious center for the renunciant bodhisattvas (p.85)" and: ". . . it is more natural to see the beginnings of the Mahāyāna in the faith and worship of stūpas (p.104)". Again, without going into detail, it must be noted that our findings do not support these conclusions. First, it is apparent from the texts cited above that the Mahāyāna of at least these documents is predominantly associated not with the stūpa cult, but with the cult of the book. This association with the cult of the book, in turn, is invariably associated with an unambiguously negative attitude to the stūpa cult. AsP is perhaps the most striking example. Of all the texts we have had occasion to study here, only SP is positive in its treatment of the stūpa cult, and even here the latter clearly shares the stage with (and is possibly subservient to) the cult of the book. By ignoring this negative treatment of the stūpa cult in a number of Mahāyāna texts (some of which are undoubtedly early), and by leaning too heavily on SP without, at

---

59 A. Hirakawa, "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas", Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko 22 (1963) 57-106.

the same time, being altogether critical in his use of it,[60] Hirakawa has presented his case in such a way as to render what is an exciting hypothesis more than a little doubtful.

If, however, his conclusions are in doubt, the importance of his initial question as to 'what constituted the institutional basis from which Mahāyāna arose' is most certainly not. And, although the form in which the question is asked may be too limited, still, on the tentative evidence of our rather limited study presented above, there appears to be at least one possibility which presents itself for future study. As we have discovered above, the pṛthivīpradeśa, the spot of earth on which the book stands, is the focal point of the cult of the book - the organizational center around which the cultic activity (flower-pūjā, dancing, etc.) takes place. Further, it is reasonable to assume that the early Mahāyāna texts, being critical of established Buddhist orthodoxy (=the Śrāvakas), could not be taught or explained or kept in the usual monastic centers, and would require the development of separate centers which would be free of orthodox interference. Since adherence to Mahāyāna meant primarily adherence to special texts in addition to those recognized by the established orthodoxy, it is natural to assume that the most obvious place around which a group of like-minded individuals could develop was the place at which the text to which they

---

[60] For example, Hirakawa (p.85-6) in his treatment of SP 340 & 344 has in some sense recognized the process of amalgamation which is going on in SP, but his position is pretty clearly that the stūpa cult represents the prior element in the process and that the cult of the book is the secondary element assimilated to it. This position, however, rests on a failure to recognize that SP 340 & 344 do not represent an isolated occurrence of this phrase either in SP itself or outside of it. When this fact is taken into account, and when the SP passages are compared with their "parallels" as they occur elsewhere, the position of SP becomes much more transparent. It is clear from such a comparison (see p.33 above) that the new element in the handling of this passage in SP is the attempted amalgamation of the stūpa cult to the cult of the book, with the latter being just as clearly the prior and primary element and the former being that which is, by SP, added on.

adhered was stored or taught. It might be assumed that from early on these places came to be conceived of as sanctified (i.e., designated by the term '<u>caityabhūta</u>') through the mechanism we have described above.

All of this, however, must be more thoroughly studied. For the time being, we would like only to suggest that such <u>pṛthivīpradeśāḥ</u> may well have formed one of the 'institutional bases' (consciously leaving room for the very likely possibility of there having been more than one) out of which early Mahāyāna arose. A corollary to this would be the assumption that, since each text placed itself at the center of its own cult, early Mahāyāna (from a sociological point of view), rather than being an identifiable single group, was in the beginning a loose federation of a number of distinct though related cults, all of the same pattern, but each associated with its specific text.

Apart from this specific passage, Hirakawa has also neglected to take into account the presence of numerous references to book worship in <u>SP</u> (99,225,226, 230,267,286,297,337,342,390,402,403,417,418) and to assess their importance and the relative importance of the references to <u>stūpa</u> worship in light of one another.

PART III: THE BHAIṢAJYAGURU-SŪTRA: A TEXT-SOURCE FOR THE CULT OF IMAGES

The Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra: A Text-source for the Cult of Images

If the translation of a Buddhist text into several different languages is an indication of its importance, then the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra is an important text. Besides its Sanskrit version discovered at Gilgit,[1] there are four Chinese translations of the text,[2] two Tibetan translations[3] and fragments preserved in Khotanese[4]

---

[1] First published by N. Dutt, "Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha-rājasūtram", Indian Historical Quarterly, supplement to Vol. 12 No. 2 (1936) 1-14 [follows p. 382], and to Vol. 12 No. 3 (1936) 14-31 [follows p. 567]; (See also N. Dutt "The Buddhist Manuscripts at Gilgit". IHQ 8 (1932) 227-36); republished N. Dutt Gilgit Manuscripts Vol. I (Srinagar: 1939) 1-32; another 'edition' appeared in P.L. Vaidya, Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha, part I (Darbhanga: 1961) 165-73 (Vaidya's Ed. is really only a reprint of Dutt's Ed. minus the latter's critical apparatus, brackets within the text, etc., and with slight alterations in punctuation.

[2] The earliest -- forming the 12th chapter of Taisho 1331 -- was translated by Śrimitra of the Eastern Chin (317-420 A.D.); the second trans. (Taisho 449) was done by Dharmagupta in 615 A.D.; a third (Taisho 450) was done in 650 A.D. by Hsüan-tsang; the last trans. was that of I-tsing in 707 A.D. as a part of Taisho 451. See P. Pelliot, "Le Bhaiṣajyaguru" Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient 3 (1903) 33-37; M.W. de Viser, Ancient Buddhism in Japan: Sūtras and Ceremonies in Use in The 7th and 8th Centuries A.D. and Their History in Later Times, Vols. 1 & 2 (Leiden: 1935) 18-21; Sodo Mori "Bhaiṣajyaguru Sūtra" Encyclopedia of Buddhism, Vol. II, fasc. 4 (1968) 668. Of these Chinese translations one, that of Hsüan-tsang, has been translated into English twice: W. Liebenthal, The Sūtra of the Lord of Healing (Peking: 1936), and Chow Su-chia, The Sūtra of the Lord of Healing (Hong Kong: n.d.).

[3] TTP Vol. No. 135, 126-2-6 to 135-4-6 (which corresponds to Taisho 451) and TTP vol. No. 136, 135-4-7 to 139-2-8. See S. Mori, Ency. of Buddh. Vol. I, fasc. 4 (1968) 668.

[4] E. Leumann, Buddhistische Literatur, Nordarisch und Deutsch, I. Teil: Nebenstücke (Leipzig: 1920) 104-10.

and Sogdian.[5] But the Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra receives and equal importance when judged by other criteria. Besides being of primary importance for the cult of Bhaiṣajyarāja, about which very little is known, especially in terms of its Indian development, it is one of the few Sūtra texts which contains detailed material on a fairly elaborate form of non-Tantric Buddhist ritual.[6] This last aspect alone is sufficient cause to undertake a translation of the text.

About our translation we should say a few words. First of all, it is nothing more than a draft translation. There are a number of textual problems and obscure passages and elements of vocabulary which remain to be satisfactorily explained. Such explanation will require a close comparative study of all versions of the text. The present translation and the notes which accompany it are based almost exclusively on the Sanskrit text. At the time that it was undertaken we did not have access to the Tibetan version and had to depend on the limited number of citations from it made by Dutt in his critical apparatus. Unfortunately, the utility of even these limited citations was considerably lessened by the fact that they are often carelessly and incorrectly given. The unavailability of the Tibetan was often a serious handicap.

---

[5] E. Benveniste, Textes Sogdiens, édités, traduits et commentés (Paris: 1940) 82-92.

[6] It is interesting to note that at least Hsüan-tsang's version -- I cannot say for the other Chinese translations -- contains a passage in which an actual dhāraṇī occurs. There is nothing in the Skt. which corresponds either to this passage as a whole or to the dhāraṇī. See Chow Su-chia trans. pp. 10-11.

What was said of the translation, applies equally to the notes. They are often times of a provisional nature and far from complete. They will require extensive revision and supplementation. A task we hope to perform in the future.

The bracketed Arabic numbers inserted into the text refer to the page numbers of N. Dutt's edition of the Sanskrit as it is printed in <u>Gilgit Manuscripts</u>, Vol. 1. The paragraphing and numbering is, of course, my own.

The Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra.[1]

Oṃ, homage to All-knowing. Homage to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharāja, the Tathāgata.

1. Thus by me was heard on one occasion: The Blessed One, roaming about the country-side, arrived in due course at the great city of Vaiśāli. At that time there in Vaiśāli he spent some time. He, at the root of a tree having the sounds of music,[2] together with a great community of bhikṣus, with eight thousand bhikṣus and with thirty-six thousand bodhisattvas, with a multitude of kings and ministers and brahmanas and heads of households, and surrounded by devas, nāgas, yakṣas, gandharvas, asuras, garuḍas, kinnaras, mahoragas, humans and non-humans, he, [thus] attended, taught dharma.

2. Then Mañjuśrī, the son of the king of dharma, through the might of the Buddha, having risen from his seat, having put his upper-robe over one shoulder, having placed his right knee on the ground, having bent forth his cupped hands toward the Blessed One, said this to the Blessed One: "Teach, O Blessed One, the names of those [previous] Tathāgatas; we, having heard the explanation of the extent [2] of the excellence of their former vows,[3] would purify all the obstructions of karma[4] for the sake of the assistence of [those] beings [who will appear] in the last time, in the last period, when a counterfeit dharma is current.[5]

Then the Blessed One gave approval to Mañjuśrī, the heir apparent: "Well done, well done, Mañjuśrī, you of great compassion. You, O Mañjuśrī, having generated immeasurable compassion, request [6] [this] for the benefit, advantage [and] happiness of [those] beings obstructed by the obstructions of karma, and for the benefit of devas and men. Therefore you, O Mañjuśrī, listen well and fix well your mind, I will speak."

"So be it, O Blessed One," Mañjuśrī, the heir apparent, [said. And] he listened to the Blessed One.

3. This [then] the Blessed One said to him: "There is, Mañjuśrī, in an eastern direction from this Buddhafield, having gone beyond buddhafields equal [in number] to the sands of ten Ganges Rivers, [7] a world-sphere called Vaidūryanirbhāsa. [8] There a Tathāgata, Arhat, Correct and Completely Awakened One by the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaidūryaprabha, [9] lives accomplished in knowledge and conduct, a world-knower and leader of the best of men to be tamed, a teacher of devas, of men, an Awakened One, [3] a Blessed One. Again, Mañjuśrī, of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, [while] formerly coursing the course of a bodhisattva, these twelve great vows were made. [And] what were these twelve great vows?

4. "The first of his great vows was [this]; 'When I, in a time not yet come, would completely awaken to the utmost, right and perfect awakening, then may immeasurable, incalculable, quite

immeasurable world-spheres, through the splendor of my body, shine, burn and be radiant. And as I am endowed with the thirty-two marks of a great man and have a body adorned with the eighty minor characteristics, just so may all beings become.'

4.2 "The second of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come, would completely awaken to utmost, right and perfect awakening, then, after having obtained awakening, may my body be thoroughly purified both internally and externally like a priceless lapis-lazuli (vaidūrya) gem, [may it] have achieved a stainless radiance, may an extensive body be established with a brilliance and lustre similar [again] to that [lapis-lazuli gem]; may its profusion of rays surpass the sun and moon, and [may all of this be in such a way] that [4] whatever beings there are in [my] world-sphere, [whatever] creatures and men, may go about [easily] in the various directions [even] in the darkness, the blackness of night; in all directions may they, touched by my splendour, do meritorious things.'

4.3 "The third of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if, after having obtained awakening, some beings of mine, [10] through being impregnated with the power of immeasurable wisdom and means, would exist for the sake of the inexhaustible pleasure and enjoyment of the immeasurable sphere of beings, [then] may there not be a defectiveness of any being whatever through whatever [agency].'

4.4 "The fourth of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then may those beings which have undertaken a deficient path, undertaken the path of disciples and pratyekabuddhas, may they all be enjoined to the great vehicle, the uttmost path of awakening.'

4.5 "The fifth of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if, after having obtained awakening, beings of mine would, through my instruction, course the religious course, may they all, having unbroken morality, be well guarded. And of whosoever has failed in morality, [if] having [only] heard my name, may there be no going anywhere to bad rebirths.'

4.6 "The sixth of his great vows was [this] [5]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if, after having obtained awakening, there are beings of mine having an imperfect body, having imperfect senses, bad coloring, are deaf-mutes, lame, [11] hunch-backs, white lepers, mutilated, [12] blind, deaf or insane and other [beings] which have diseases in their bodies, may they, having heard my name, all become such as have perfect senses and fully formed limbs.'

4.7 "The seventh of his great vows: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if, after having obtained awakening, there are beings of mine tormented by various diseases, without

defense, without refuge, deprived of a means of subsistence and medicine, without a protector, poor and miserable, if my name would fall on their ears, then may all their diseases be allayed and may they be healthy and free of calamities, up to: [may they] end in awakening.'

4.8 "The eighth of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if whatever woman, afflicted with the many thousands of defects of women, but desiring release from womanhood and abhorring existence as a woman, would bear in mind my name, may there be no [further] existence as a woman of that woman, up to: [may she] end in awakening.'[13]

4.9 "The ninth of his great [6] vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then may I, after having obtained awakening, having turned all beings bound by the bonds of the snares of mara [and] arrived at the impassable pass of the various views away from all the snares of mara and false views, having enjoined [them] to correct views, may I in due order show them the course of the bodhisattva.'[14]

4.10 "The tenth of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if, after having obtained awakening, there are some beings of mine frightened by fear and apprehension of rulers, or who are restrained and bound with bonds, sentenced to death, oppressed by numerous frauds and dishonored, afflicted with

suffering of body, speech and mind, may they, through hearing my name and through the power of my merit, be freed from all fear and oppression.'

4.11 "The eleventh of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if, after having obtained awakening, there are beings of mine burnt with the fire of hunger, intent on the search for food and drink, who do evil having pleasure as its cause, [and] if they would bear in mind my name, may I refresh their body with food endowed with [fine] color, smell [7] and taste.'

4.12 "The twelfth of his great vows was [this]: 'When I, in a time not yet come...am awakened...then if, after obtaining awakening, there are some beings of mine without clothes, poor, oppressed by heat and cold, gad-flies and gnats, who experience suffering night and day, [and] if they would bear in mind my name, may I collect clothes and the means of subsistence for them, may I present them with the desired objects colored with many hues, may I completely fulfill the wishes of all beings with the music of tūryas and tāḍāvacaras, with ungents, garlands, scents and ornaments of jewels.'

"These Mañjuśrī, are the twelve great vows which the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Correctly and Completely Awakened One, made [while] formerly coursing the course

of awakening.[15]

5. "Again, further Mañjuśrī, it is not possible to exhaust in a kalpa or the remainder of a kalpa that which is the array of qualities of the Buddhafield and the vow of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata. Well purified is that Buddhafield, [8] completely free of rocks, grit and gravel; free of love and hate; free of [even] the words 'suffering' and 'misfortune';[16] free of women. And the great earth there is made of lapis-lazuli, [and] the walls, ramparts, mansions, arches, lattices and turrets are made of the seven precious things. As is Sukhāvatī, so is [this] world-sphere.[17] There in that world-sphere Vaidūryanirbhāsa there are two bodhisattvas at the head of those immeasurable and uncountable bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, the first called Sūryavairocana, the second Candravairocana, who preserve the storehouse of good dharma of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata. Therefore, then Mañjuśrī, by a believing son or daughter of good family a vow sould be made for rebirth there in that Buddhafield."

6. Then again the Blessed One spoke to Mañjuśrī, the heir apparent: "There are, Mañjuśrī, common beings who do not know [the difference between] good and bad action, they, overcome by perplexity, not knowing the act of giving and the great result of giving, stupid

and the foremost of the puerile, defective in their faculties of faith, wholly intent on guarding an accumulation of material wealth, whose thoughts, when the time for giving has arrived, do not go towards the distribution of gifts or [if they give] they suffer in mind as if [by that giving] they are [9] cutting the flesh from their own body. And there are many beings who [will] not [allow] even themselves [to] enjoy [their goods], how much less, will give [them] to [their] mother and father and wife and daughters; even less so to [their] slaves and hired help, even less so to other beggars. Beings such as that, having deceased here, will be reborn in the world of ghosts or among animals. By those formerly born as men the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard there, [and] to those [of that former group now] abiding in the world of Yama or among animals, the name of that Tathāgata will [again] become present. Through only remembering [it], having passed away from those places, they once again will be reborn in the world of men and they will remember their [former] births. They, frightened by a fear of [further] bad births, will not again be desirous for objects of sense; they will be delighted in giving and the praisers of giving. Moreover, by gradually renouncing all, they will hand over to the beggars even their hands and feet and head and eyes and flesh and blood, how much more their other heaps of wealth. [10]

7. "Again, further, Mañjuśrī, there are beings who uphold the rules of training [18] in the name of the Tathāgatas who sometime or other fall into an error of morality or fall into an error of views or conduct. Those having errored in morality who again become possessed of morality, who protect morality, not further do they seek for great learning and they do not know the deep meaning of the sūtras spoken by the Tathāgata. And again those who are of great learning will become arrogant; rigid with pride, ending in envy of others, they repudiate the good dharma, they reject [it]. They, taking the side of Māra, such [persons] are deluded persons; themselves having entered on a low path, they cause any number of other beings to take a great fall. The abode and place of rebirth of such beings will, for the most part, be hell. [But] in that case, by which of those the name of the Blessed One, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will [here have] been heard, to them [later] abiding there in hell, the name of that Tathāgata, through the might of the Buddha, [11] will [also] be present. They [through the presence of that name], having passed away from there, will once again be reborn in the world of men; endowed with correct views, possessed of vigor, having their intention on the good, they having given up their homes, having set forth in the instructions of the Tathāgata, will in due order fully fulfill the course of a bodhisattva.

8. "Again, further, Mañjuśrī, there are beings who speak praise of themselves [while] they pronounce dispraise of [their] enemies, of others; those beings who disparage others and exhalt themselves, having each honored only himself, will experience suffering for many thousands of years in the three unfortunate places of rebirth. They, with the passing of several thousand years, having passed away from there, are reborn among animals, among cows, horses, bulls, asses, etc.; they, beaten with blows of whips and goads, [12] having bodies tormented by hunger and thirst, go down the road carrying great loads. If some time or other they will gain the advantage of rebirth as a man, [still] they will always be reborn in inferior families and will, in servitude, be subject to the will of others. [But] by which of those previously reborn among men the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, they, through that root of merit, will be freed from all suffering and will come to have keen faculties; [will be] learned, distinguished and of powerful intellect; engaged in seeking the good, they will always gain a meeting with a good [spiritual] friend; having cut the snares of Māra, they burst the shell of ignorance, [13] cause the rivers of impurities to dry up, and are freed from birth, old age, sickness, death, fear, sorrow, lamentation, suffering, dispair and anxiety.

9. "Again, further, Mañjuśrī, there are beings who, engaged in the slander of [other] persons, mutually cause debates, contentions and quarrels with one another; those beings mutually having thoughts of contention, fabricate various sorts of 'Good', [while] through [acts] of body, speech and mind they constantly desire each other's disadvantage and advance for each other's undoing. They compel the devatā of the forest to draw near, [19] and in the burning grounds they compel the different devatā of trees and devatā of the house to draw near; [20] and [when] they worship yakṣas and rakṣasas living on flesh and blood, they deprive living animals of life. Having made the name or a likeness (pratimā) of the body of their enemy, they then conjure up awful spells [21] [and], through the additional aid of kākorda and vetāla demons, [22] they desire to ruin his body and [14] create obstacles to his life. But by which [beings] the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, of them it is not possible to create an obstacle by any means. [23] And they all mutually dwell having thoughts of friendliness, of each other's advantage and good fortune, much pleased through each other's assistance.

10. "Again, further, Mañjuśrī, these four groups -- bhikṣus, bhikṣunis, lay men and women -- [24] and which other believing sons and daughters of good family furnished with the worthy eight-limbed

[precept][25] observe the fast [and] will uphold the rules of training for a year or three months, the vow of whom is thus: 'may we thus, by our thinking of it and by our root of merit, be reborn in the western region, in the world-sphere of Sukhāvatī where Amitāyus, the Tathāgata, is', by which [of these beings] the name of that Blessed One, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will be heard, at the time of their death eight bodhisattvas, having come through magic power, will show [them] the way [to Sukhāvatī]; they, miraculously produced, will become manifest there [in Sukhāvatī sitting] in various colored lotuses.[26] Further, whichever [of those beings] are reborn in the deva-world, the previous root of merit of those reborn there is not diminished [15] and there will be no [further] undergoing of unfortunate births. They, having passed away from there, will be reborn here in the world of men and will be kings, lords of the four continents, wheel-turners; they will cause several kotis of niyutas of hundreds of thousands of beings to be established in the ten good paths of action.[27] Still later they will be reborn in the families of the great Kṣtriya households, of the great Brahmana households, in the families of great householders and in families abundantly endowed with many granaries and store-rooms and wealth and property; they will be endowed with a handsome appearance and they will be endowed with power and they will be endowed with a [great] following.

11. "Again, by which[-ever] woman the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will be heard or preserved, of her it is to be expected that just this [present birth] is to be the last birth as a woman." [28]

12. Then Mañjuśrī, the heir apparent, said this to the Blessed One: "I, Blessed One, in the last time, in the last period, will cause those believing sons and daughters of good family to hear the name of [16] that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata; even in their sleep I will cause the name of that Buddha to be recited in their ear. [Those] who will preserve this precious sūtra, will recite it, will demonstrate or master or illuminate it in full detail for others, or write it or cause it to be written or, having made it into a book, will worship it with manifold flowers and incense and perfumes and garlands and unguents and umbrellas and flags and banners [29]-- by them, having wrapped it with cloths of five colors, it is to be set up on a purified spot. [30] Where, only, this sutra is set up, there the Four Great Kings together with their retinue, and many koṭis of niyutas of hundreds of thousands of other devas will approach, there where this sutra will circulate. [31] And they will illuminate this precious sūtra. [Those who] will preserve the explanation [31] of the extent of the excellence of the former vows of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, and [will preserve] the name [17] of that Tathāgata,

of them there will be no untimely death, and not by any means whatever is it possible to steal away their vital warmth or, [if] carried away, their vital warmth once again returns to its usual channel."[33]

13. The Blessed One said: "So it is, Mañjuśrī, so it is as you say. And, Mañjuśrī, which believing son or daughter of good family desires to perform the pūjā of that Tathāgata, by him a likeness (pratimā)[34] of that Tathāgata is to be caused to be made; by [him] furnished with the worthy precept having eight limbs[35] the fast (upavāsa) is to be observed for seven days and nights. Having, through purification, made a purified food-offering, having strewn that purified spot with numerous flowers, [he is to stand] on that spot of earth [that has been] incensed with various perfumes, adorned with numerous clothes, umbrellas, banners and flags, [he is to stand] with his limbs well bathed and wearing clean white clothes,[36] with unsoiled thoughts, unmuddied thoughts, with thoughts free of evil intent, with thoughts of friendliness for all beings, of patience, having the same thoughts in [18] the presence of all beings. With a music of singing and various instruments that likeness of the Tathāgata is to be circumambulated. The previous vows of that Tathāgata are to be fixed in mind. This sūtra is to be recited. Whatever he [who performs this pūjā] is intent on, whatever he asks for, all his wishes are completely fulfilled: if

he desires long life, [then] he becomes one having long life; if he asks for pleasures, [then] he becomes abundantly endowed with them; if he wishes for power, he obtains that with little difficulty; if he longs for a son, he gets a son. Who here sees evil dreams in which the crow appears, or sees [37] bad omens in which a hundred inauspicious [signs] appear, by them the pūjā of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata is to be performed, and [through that] the presence of all bad dreams [19] and inauspicious bad omens will be dissipated. Of those who are afraid of fire, water, poison, attack with a sword, angry elephants, lions, tigers, bears, leopards, poisonous snakes, scorpions, centipedes, gnats, gadflies, etc., by them the pūjā of that Tathāgata is to be performed, [and] they will be freed from all fear. Of those who are afraid of thiefs, of robbers, by them is the pūjā of that Tathāgata to be performed.

14. "Again, further, Mañjuśrī, which believing sons or daughters of good family take the three-fold refuge for as long as they live and are without any other devatā; [38] [39] which [beings] uphold the five rules of training, [40] and which [beings] uphold the four hundred most excellent rules of training which are the obligation of a bodhisattva, and again which bhikṣus, having gone forth from dwelling in a house, uphold the two hundred and fifty rules of training, [41] which bhikṣunis uphold [their] five hundred rules of training, and

which [beings], in that they have been taken hold of by a different rule of training, [20] are fallen away from [those former] rules of training, if they, frightened by a fear of bad rebirth, would preserve the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, [42] not again of them is the suffering of going to the three [43] unfortunate rebirths to be expected. And which woman, about to give birth, experiences intense, unpleasant, hot, searing labor pains, [but] who would remember the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha the Tathāgata, and would perform [his] pūjā, she will give forth comfortably, and will give birth to a son having all his limbs fully formed. Handsome, attractive to be looked upon; having sharp faculties, intelligent; he will be healthy and have very little trouble, and it is not possible for his vital warmth to be snatched away by non-human beings." [44]

15. [45] Then again the Blessed One said to the Venerable Ānanda: "Do you, Ānanda, believe, and will you trust in those qualities of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, [21] the Tathāgata, Arhat, Correctly and Completely Awakened One, [46] which I will relate, or is there of you some worry or doubt or hesitation here, in the profound range of [this] Buddha?"

Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: "Not of me, Revered Blessed One, is there a worry or doubt or hesitation in the sūtras spoken by the Tathāgata. What is the reason

for that? There are no impure actions of body, speech or mind of the Tathāgatas. Blessed One, both the sun and the moon, though having great power, though having great might, could fall to the earth; or Sumeru, that king of mountains, could be moved from its foundations; but there could be of Buddhas no false utterance. [47] But further Revered Blessed One, there are beings defective in the faculty of faith who, having heard this range of [that] Buddha, will speak thus: how is it [possible that] so many [22] qualities and benefits come to be through only hearing the name of that Tathāgata? [48] They do not believe [in it], do not trust [in it], they reject [it]. Of them a long night will come to no profit, help, no ease [for them], to [their] loss."

The Blessed One said: "It is impossible Ānanda, it is inconceivable that of that being by whom the name of that Tathāgata is heard there could be the undergoing of a bad and unfortunate rebirth; that situation does not occur. [49] Ānanda, the Buddha range of Buddhas is hard to be believed. That you, Ānanda, believe [in it], trust [in it], this is to be seen [as resulting from] the might of the Buddha. Here is no place for all disciples and Pratyekabuddhas, except for those bound to [only] one birth, the bodhisattvas, mahasattvas. [50] Ānanda, obtaining existence as a man is difficult; having respect and faith in the three precious things is difficult; hearing the name of a Tathāgata is still more difficult. Ānanda, the

bodhisattva course of that Blessed One, the Tathāgata [23] Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha is immeasurable, [his] skill in means also is immeasurable, and immeasurable is the extent of the various vows of this [Buddha]. I, [if] wishing to, could proclaim the detailed exposition of that bodhisattva course for a kalpa or the remainder of the kalpa, but, Ānanda, a kalpa could pass [and still] it would not be possible to reach the end of the extent of the previous vows of that Blessed One, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata."

16. Then at that time a bodhisattva, mahāsattva named Trāṇamukta [51] appeared in that assembly. Having been seated, he rose [24] from his seat; having put his upper-robe over one shoulder, having put his right knee on the ground, having bent forth his cupped hands towards the Blessed One, he said this to him: "There will be, Revered Blessed One, in the last time, in the last period, beings afflicted with many diseases, having emaciated limbs from long illness, having lips and throat parched from hunger and thirst, facing death, surrounded by lamenting friends and blood relatives, seeing only darkness in every direction and being drawn away by the people of Yama. When the body of such a one is lying on his bed, his consciousness (vijñāna) [52] is brought into the presence of Yama, the king of dharma. And what is related to the nature of that being, just whatever good or bad was done by that person, having

registered all that, it is presented to Yama, the king of dharma. Then Yama, the king of dharma, further asks about it, evaluates [it], and according to whether good or bad was done of this one, he gives an appropriate order. [But] on that occasion those who were friends [25] and blood-relatives would, on account of his suffering, go for refuge to that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, and they would perform the pūjā of that Tathāgata.[53] The case does occur in which the consciousness of that one could return again [54] [immediately; [55] if so] he reflects on [that] self [and its experience before Yama] as if it had occurred in a dream; or if in seven days or in twenty-one days or in thirty-five days or in forty-nine days his consciousness would once again return, he would have full recollection [of the previous events]. The results of his own actions, [both] good and bad, become directly perceptible. He having known [that], in those things having life as a motive, will never again do an evil or bad act. Therefore, by a believing son or daughter of good family the pūjā of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, is to be performed."

17. Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the bodhisattva named Trāṇamukta: "How, son of good family, is the pūjā of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata to be performed?" [26] The bodhisattva Trāṇamukta said: "Revered Ānanda, those who desire to release [him] from great illness, [56] by them,

on account of that suffering, the fast characterized by the worthy eight-limbed [precept] is to be undergone for seven days; the pūjā of and attendance on the community of bhiksus with food and drink [and] all the means of subsistence is, according to one's means, to be performed. The name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, is to be fixed in the mind three times in the night, three times in the day. On forty-nine days this sūtra is to be uttered. Forty-nine lamps are to be lighted. Seven likenesses are to be made. With each individual likeness seven lamps are to be lighted. Each lamp is to be made the size of a wheel of a cart. If on the forty-ninth day the light [of these lamps] is not exhausted, it is to be known that all is well;[57] and forty-nine additional banners having five colors are to be made.[58] [27]

18. "Again further, Revered Ānanda, of which anointed kṣatriya kings calamities or foreboding natural phenomenon would come to be imminent, or devastation from disease, or devastation by one's own troops or those of others, devastation from asterisms or devastation from solar eclipses or from lunar eclipses, or from wind and rain out of season, or from drought or the appearance of inauspicious signs or plague[59] or imminent disaster, then that anointed kṣatriya king should become one with thoughts of friendliness towards all beings and [all] beings held in bonds should be set free. And as

the pūjā of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, was formerly described, it [is here] to be performed. Then, through this root of merit of that consecrated kṣatriya king and through the extension of the different previous vows of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata,[60] there will be security there in [his] realm, abundance of provisions; there will be the benefit of the desired wind and rain at the proper season and all beings inhabiting his realm will be free of disease, delighted, having much to rejoice at. And not there in that realm do malignant Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, Bhūtas and Piśācas cause injury to those beings. And they do not see any bad omens. And there will be of that anointed kṣatriya king an increase in length of life, [good] color, strength, health and sovereignty."[61]

19. Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the bodhisattva Trāṇamukta: "How, son of good family, does one having a diminished life once again lengthen [it]?"

Trāṇamukta, the bodhisattva, said: "Surely by you Revered Ānanda [this] was heard in the presence of the Tathāgata.[62] There are untimely deaths. For those the use of mantras and herbs with counteraction are prescribed. There are beings afflicted with disease. And it is not a slight disease. Having failed to turn their attention to medicines, or if physicians do not effect [proper] remedies;[63] [29] this is the first untimely death. By

whom death is by the authority of the king; [this] is the second untimely death. Those who are excessively careless, of those addicted to carelessness, non-humans [64] carry away the vital warmth; [this] is the third untimely death. Those who die through being burnt by fire; [this] is the fourth untimely death. And those who die by water [this] is the fifth untimely death. Those who in the midst of lions, tigers, beasts of prey and fierce wild animals fix [their] dwelling and [of course] die; [this] is the sixth untimely death. Those who fall from mountain sides; this is the seventh untimely death. Those who die through the use of poison, kākhordas and Vetālas; this is the eighth untimely death. Those who, afflicted with hunger and thirst, not obtaining food and drink, suffering, die; this is the ninth untimely death. These in brief are the untimely deaths pointed out by the Tathāgata; and there are an immeasurable number of other untimely deaths."

20. Then again twelve great Yakṣa-generals came to be seated there in that assembly, namely the great Yakṣa-general named Kiṃbhīra and the great Yakṣa-generals named Vajra, [30] Mekhila, Antiloka, Anila, Saṇṭhila, Indala, Pāyila, Mahāla, Cidāla, Caundhula and Vikala. [65] These twelve great Yakṣa-generals, each surrounded by his followers, with a single voice spoke thus to the Blessed One: "Heard by us through the Blessed One, through the might of the Buddha, is the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūrya-

prabha, the Tathāgata. Not again of us is there a fear of bad rebirth. Therefore, [66] we united, for as long as we live, all go to the Buddha [31] as refuge, to the dharma as refuge, to the samgha as refuge; we will make a great effort for the advantage, benefit and happiness of all beings; who, particularly, will circulate this sūtra in a village or city or in the country-side or in a forest retreat, or who will preserve the name of this Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, who will perform the pūjā and attendance [of him], that being especially, Blessed One, we will protect, we will guard, we will free from all inauspiciousness and will completely fulfill all his hopes.[67]

Then further the Blessed One gave approval to those Yakṣa-generals: "It is well, it is well, O great Yakṣa-generals, what you have promised for the sake of all beings remembering the gratitude of that Blessed One, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata."

21. Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: "What is the name of this discourse on dharma, Blessed One, and how should I bear it in mind?" The Blessed One said: "You, Ānanda, should bear this discourse on dharma in mind this way: [as] 'The extent of the variety of the previous [32] vows of Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata.' [Also] bear it in mind as 'The vow of the twelve great Yakṣa-generals.'" [68]

22. This the Blessed One said.[69] With their minds transported [with joy], Mañjuśrī, the heir apparent, the Venerable Ānanda, and the Bodhisattva Trāṇamukta, and those bodhisattvas and great disciples, and the kings, their councillors, Brahmanas and house-holders, that entire assembly and the world together with its devas, men, asuras and gandharvas rejoiced at the words of the Blessed One.

23. The Mahāyāna Sūtra named Ārya-Bhaiṣajyaguru is completed.

Notes

[1]*The Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra: this is a provisionary title. Dutt in his edition of the text gives this as the title in the table of contents and at the head of that part of the introduction devoted to our text. But on the title page to the actual edition and on the first page of the text he gives the title as Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharājasūtram. Vaidya also has this latter form as the title for our Text. Dutt (intro. p. 47) noted that there was a lack of uniformity in the title given to the text, that the Tibetan version gave the title in transliteration as Ārya-Bhagavato Bhaiṣajyaguru-Vaidūryaprabhasya Pūrvapraṇidhāna-viśeṣa-vistara nāma mahāyāna-sūtra (in Tib.: phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman [Dutt has 'smon'] gyi bla vai du rya'i 'od kyi [rgyal po'i; omitted by Dutt. See TPP 135-4-7] sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa śes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo) He noted further that "The Tibetan title though too long is not without a basis for we have on page 2 [of his ed.] the following passage in which Mañjuśrī requests Buddha to deliver the sūtra in these words: "deśayatu bhagavāṃs teṣāṃ tathāgatānāṃ nāmadheyāni pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistara-vibhaṅgam." Oddly enough this is a misquotation; the text reads, as Dutt himself has edited it: deśayatu bhagavāṃs teṣāṃ tathāgatānāṃ nāmadheyāni / teṣāṃ pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistara-vibhaṅgam vayaṃ

śrutvā, etc. And thus does not refer to Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha explicitly, if at all. This is not to say that the Tibetan title is "without a basis"; its "basis" is perhaps much stronger than Dutt suggests. Bhg. 16.9 & 12 has: / te ca bhagavan idaṃ sūtraratnaṃ prakāśayiṣyanti / tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇi-dhānaviśeṣavistaravibhāgaṃ ca tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayiṣyanti teṣāṃ nākālamaraṇaṃ bhaviṣyati, etc. At Bhg. 23.2 (para. 15) the praṇidhānaviśeṣavistara of Bhaiṣajya, are said to be immeasurable; at Bhg. 23.6 (para. 15) the Blessed One says he could speak for a kalpa and not śakyaṃ tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistarāntam adhigantum. Bhg 27.11 (para. 18) says that it is through the root of merit of the king who performs the pūjā of Bhaiṣaj. and through the pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistara of Bhaiṣaj. that security is established in the realm of that king; finally and perhaps most important is Bhg. 31.11 (para. 21), which in form is the stereotypical conclusion to a mahāyāna sūtra: Ānanda says ko nāmāyaṃ bhagavan dharmaparyāyaḥ kathaṃ cainaṃ dhārayāmi / bhagavān āha / tena hy Ānanda dharmaparyāyam idaṃ bhaiṣajyaguru-vaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistaram iti / dhāraya dvādaśānāṃ mahāyakṣasenā-patīnāṃ praṇidhānam iti dhāraya [the Tib. adds to this two additional titles, see below]. Thus, not only is the pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistara of the Tathāgata Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha a frequent, perhaps

dominant theme of Bhg., but also the first title which the text itself recommends for the work is almost exactly that given to it by the Tib. translation. All of this shows that the title of the work in its Tib. translation is firmly based on, and comes out of, the work itself.

Dutt has also noted that the Śikṣāsamuccaya quotes our work under the title Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharāja-sūtra. This refers to the citation at Śikṣā 174.1 ff of Bhg. 19.8-20.3, Bhg. 20.10-22.8, Bhg. 14.16-15.8, and Bhg. 15.8-10 one after another in this order. All of the quoted passages in Śikṣā. exhibit some variation with their corresponding passages in Bhg. as edited by Dutt. Śāntideva has either quoted loosely or from a recension of the text different from the one we now have. What Dutt did not note was that Śikṣa 13.12-15 also quotes a passage from a Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha-sūtra. Bendall (Śikṣā ed. 370) and Vaidya (Śikṣā ed. 11,202) and Edgerton (BHSD 412[2]) all assumed that the Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha-sūtra was the same as the Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharāja-sūtra, but there is now some doubt about this. Śikṣa 13.12-15 reads as follows: etac ca bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasūtre draṣṭavyaṃ yas tu mahāsattva evaṃ śrutvāpi bodhisattvacaryāduṣkaratām api prajñayāvagāhyotsahata eva sakaladuḥkhitajanaparitrāṇadhuram avavoḍhuṃ tena vandanapūjanapāpadeśanapuṇyānumodanabuddhādhyeṣaṇa- yācanabodhipariṇāmanaṃ kṛtvā kalyāṇamitram adhyeṣya taduktānuvādena svayaṃ vā

vaktavyaṃ / samanvāhara ācāryāham evaṃ nāmety uktvā [And this is to be seen in the Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha-sūtra: surely which great being, having certainly heard thus the difficulty of the course of a bodhisattva [and] also with wisdom having plunged into it, is still able to bear the burden of the rescue of men from all suffering -- by him, having turned over to awakening [the merit from] soliciting and questioning Buddhas and the rejoicing in merit and confessing and worshipping and honoring, having questioned his kalyāṇamitra and through his own repetition of that which was said, it is to be declared: 'take note, teacher! I thus having declared such and such a name...]. This passage is nowhere found in the Bhg. as we now have it; further its tone and content seem to be unrelated to Bhg. as a whole. Yet it is cited from a text whose title clearly associates it with, if not our text, at least our Buddha. Our text almost always refers to the Tathāgata with which it is associated as Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha. The one exception is in the opening invocation which reads: namo bhagavate bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharājāya tathāgatāya, but even this is not supported by the Tib. which has instead saṅs rgyas daṅ byaṅ chub sems dpa' thams cad la phag 'tshal lo. Thus the title Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharāja-sūtra has little, if any justification, and the appropriate title would seem to be Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha. But this obviously does not fit the data of the Śikṣa which not only uses the form Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharāja in

the title but also wherever the name occurs in the passages which it quotes from our text. It is possible that these two similar titles may refer either to two separate works or to two different recensions of the same basic text. Until this can be determined it is perhaps advisable to use neither, since both are problematic. As an alternative we could refer to the text by the title which the Tib. translation gives it and which as we have seen has a firm foundation in the text and is perhaps most fully descriptive of its contents. Against this we have Dutt's Ms. B, the only Ms. to judge from Dutt's critical apparatus which has the final conclusion stereotypical of mahāyāna sūtras, which concludes the text thus: āryabhaiṣajyaguru nāma mahāyānasūtraṃ samāptam. It is on the basis of this fact that we have provisionally given the title as "The Bhaiṣajyaguru Sūtra".

Additional data: In a list of sūtras Mvy 1404 gives the title Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha-sūtra. According to Bendall's notes (p. 396) the passage quoted at Śikṣa 13.12-15 is also quoted at Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā Ad III,23, but he does not say under what, if any, title. Judging from BHSD 412[2] there is also a reference to the work at Mmk. 719 but its exact nature is unclear from the entry in BHSD.

[2] Vādyasvaravṛkṣamūle: Dutt cites the Tib. as: rol mo'i sgra can gyi śiṅ pjon ma [pjon ma is impossible; the correct

reading is probably *śiṅ ljon pa* (Tib. -Skt. Dict. pt. 11.2347)] and gives the Skt. equivalent as *vādyasvaravṛkṣaḥ*. The Ch., according to Dutt, suggests *manojñasvaraḥ*; but Chow Su-chia translates: "He dwelt under a tree in which music resounded" (p.1. I have been unable to see Liebenthal's translation.)

[3] (*teṣām*) *pūrvapraṇidhānaviśeṣavistaravibhaṅgam*. This compound or close variants thereof occurs several times throughout our text (see above n. 1). We have consistently translated *-vistara-* there by 'extent' or 'extension' rather than by the more usual 'in detail', because the latter, though possible on a few occasions, did not do well for all the contexts; see esp. *Bhg*. 27.11 (para.18).

[4] *sarvakarmāvaraṇāni viśodhayem*; this, and the phrase 'you...request this for the benefit, advantage [and] happiness of [those] beings obstructed by the obstructions of karma [*samādhesase* (cf. below n. 6) *nānākarmāvaraṇenāvṛtānām sattvānām arthāya hitāya sukhāya*] which occurs a few lines later, gives some indication of the level of teaching at which our text aims. See, for example, Conze's discussion (*The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (The Hague: 1960) 81) of the differences between the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya* and the *Svalpākṣara-prajñāpāramitā*. [On the *āvaraṇas* generally see L. de La Vallée Poussin. *Vijñāptimā-*

tratāsiddhi, La Siddhi de Hiuan-tsang (Paris: 1928-29) 566] This is perhaps supported by the fact that one of the two additional titles given by the Tib. in section para. 21 of our text is: las kyi sgrib pa thams cad rnam par spyad źiṅ re ba thams cad yoṅs su stod bces bya bar yaṅ bzuṅ śig = sarvakarmāvaraṇaviśuddhi-sarvāśāparipūraṇam ity api nāma dhāraya.: 'bear it in mind also under the name 'the fulfillment of all desires and the purification of all obstructions of karma'.

[5] paścime kale paścime samaye [saddharmapratirūpake] vartamane; Dutt supplies saddharmapratirūpake on the basis -- apparently -- of Tib. dam pa'i chos ltar bcos-pa 'byuṅ ba na; but if this is the only basis and the Ms. gives no indication of such a reading, it should be omitted. see É. Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien (Louvain: 1958) 210 ff, for some general remarks on the concept of 'the last time'.

[6] samādhesase; we follow here the Tib.: gsol pa [=ba] 'debs pa ni legs so, for which Dutt gives prārthayati as the Skt. equivalent; but Tib.-Skt. Dict. 2503-04 suggests adhyeṣati. Dutt's ms. c. has samādhyesasi.

[7] asti mamjuśrīḥ [pūrva]smin digbhāge ito buddhakṣetrād daśagaṃgānadīvālukāsamāni buddhakṣetrāṇy atikramya, etc. this is a stereotypical expression, see Saṃdhinirmocana II,1; Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka

7.16, etc.

8 Vaidūryanirbhāsa: 'having the appearance of lapis-lazuli.' Sukh. 5.13 refers to a former Buddha of this name.

9 Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha: here again there are problems with this name: ŚsP 1.10 gives Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha as the name of a Tathāgata; while Bhaiṣajyarāja is, by SP 3.5,224.1 ff, 267.1, 395.1 ff. 404.3,5, 414.7 ff., 425.3, 470.11, given as the name of a bodhisattva, and at LV. 172.8 as that of a former Buddha; MmK. 64.2 gives Bhaiṣajyavaidūryarāja as the name of a Tathāgata [BHSD 412[2] thinks that "Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha(rāja)" is probably intended.] Mvy 3321 gives Vaidūryaprabha as the name of a nāga. As background to the name it should be remembered that Bhaiṣajyaguru [as well as Vaidyarāja] is an old epithet of the Buddha Śākyamuni; see P. Demiéville in Hobogirin, "Byo", pp. 228,230-31; É. Lamotte, Le Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse, T. I (Louvain: 1949) 17 n.1.

10 ...tadā bodhiprāptasya ca me ye sattva. This troublesome idiom occurs in almost all the remaining vows. A similar construction is found in Sukha. (Vaidya ed.) 227.11 (vow 18): sacen me bhagavan bodhiprāptasya ye sattva...; and Sukha. 229.1 (vow 32): sacen me bhagavan bodhiprāptasya ye sattva. Müller (SBE 49, pt. II, p. 19) translates the latter: "O Bhagavat, if the beings belonging to me, after I have obtained Bodhi...". We have taken ca in Bhg. to

equal ced. but should like to see how the Tib. understood the phrase. Cf. Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka 110.8: bodhiprāptasya ca mama...

[11] 'Lame'=lamga=laṅga; see BHSD 460[2], 'laṅgaka', SP 29.5; MDPPL 339, laṅga=źa bo, AsP 426; laṅga='theṅ po, Ad 225a.

[12] 'Mutilated'= kuṇḍa=(?)kuṇṭha; see BHSD 185[2] 'kuṇṭha' 'kuṇḍa', 'kuṇḍaka', SP 95.5; MDPPL 152, 'kuṇṭha= rdum po, AsP 426.

[13] This is the first of several references to women in our text. It is perhaps characteristic of Bhg. that reference to women is noticeably present, if not prominent. The basic attitude which underlies the tone and content of these reference is not easily established. Although the overt expression seems to imply a certain disdain, our text has clearly tried to accommodate itself to the needs of women and to include her (usually by making it possible for her to become a man) in the religious sphere it envisages; cf. Bhg. 8.2 (para.5) 15.8-10 (para. 11), 20.3-9 (para. 14).

[14] The phraseology of this vow — a little clumsy — makes it somewhat suspect, although it seems to bear some relation to the fourth vow. Those vows which precede and follow it turn on the hearing of the Tathāgata's name, which is absent here. Here also the emphasis on an adequate preparation of the individual concerned (i.e. being already established in correct views) is foreign to the rest of these vows. Ms C has: -sattvān pāśaih parimocayeyam /

nānādṛṣṭigahanasaṃkaṭaprāptaḥ / tān samyagdṛṣṭyā pratiṣṭhāpayeyam anupūrvaṃ.

[15] 'The course of awakening': bodhicārikāṃ; but perhaps this should read bodhisattvacārikāṃ instead, as at Bhg. 3.2.

[16] apagatāpāyaduḥkhaśabda, possibly 'free of the sounds of suffering from the states of woe'.

[17] yādṛśī sukhāvatī lokadhātus tādṛśī. This reference to Sukhāvatī could have significance for establishing the relative chronology of our text. Its use here seems to assume that descriptions of Sukhāvatī were well enough known so that by merely asserting the similarity to it of some other buddhafield, that other buddhafield, by a kind of short-hand, would be adequately described. In addition, this is not the only reference to Sukhāvatī in our text; Bhg. 14.5 ff is both more explicit in its reference and more ambiguous in that which concerns the relationship of our text to the set of ideas centered on Sukhāvatī. See below n.

[18] śikṣāpada; see Lamotte, Histoire, 76-77 and below

[19] āvāhayanti, which might loosely be translated 'they conjure' or 'coerce'. The basic idea seems similar to that outlined by D. Snellgrove (Four Lamas of Dolpo, I (Oxford: 1967) 24-25) in discussing a Tibetan term of similar import. "Rather more difficult to explain

is the process of the actual 'coercing' of one's chosen divinity. We really have no satisfactory western term for this practice, since western mystics have never tried to do quite this kind of thing despite the variety of their meditative practices. The Tibetan term (bsNyen - sGrub) is another of the concise compound terms which Tibetans seem to like so much. The first part of the term means literally 'bringing near' and the second part means 'achieving or effecting'. (It corresponds with the Indian Buddhist term sādhana.) The nearest concise English translation for the whole idea is probably 'coercing', for in effect one 'coerces' the divinity by concentrating upon his imagined form and by repeating his spell. This translation is only unsuitable in that it suggests a lack of respect for the divinity, who is revered and worshipped as well as being 'coerced'".

20 vṛkṣadevatām giridevatām ca śmaśāneṣu pṛthakpṛthagbhūtān āvāhayanti. Pṛthakpṛthagbhūta is here perhaps capable of another interpretation. The Tib. renders the final -bhūta by 'byuṅ po' undoubtedly intending thereby 'demon', 'evil spirit', thus allowing for the translation 'the separate different demons'. Since, according to MW 761[3], a 'bhūta' may be "the ghost of a deceased person", the connection of pṛthakpṛthagbhūta with the 'burning grounds' here is perhaps supportive of the Tib. In addition our text elsewhere uses bhūta as 'demon' (Bhg. 28.3 (para. 18)).

21 ghoravidyā: rig sṅags dag po: Dutt in his introduction (p. 55) paraphrases this passage by: "There are some...who practice dreadful (Tantric) practices (ghoravidyām)".

22 kākordavetālānuprayogena: the Tib. according to Dutt is simply byad stems, Jäschkes' definition of which is instructive: "imprecation, malediction, combined with sorcery, the name of an enemy being written on a slip of paper and hid in the ground, under various conjurations (Tib. -Eng. Dict., 375[1]). On the other hand, it seems clear from BHSD 175[1] and 503[1] that kākorda and vetāla are the names for two kinds of demons. cf. Bhg. para. 19.

23 This may be an extremely important passage for understanding the mentality and the 'magical' mechanisms which underlie much of our text. The procedure for 'magically' harming an individual is, in outline, fairly simple: it requires the possession of the name or likeness of the individual to be harmed, plus the use of spells which presumably bring into play the additional power of certain demons. Judging from our present passage this procedure can be counter-acted by the possession of another (by implication, more powerful) name; i.e. Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūrya. But this is not all. We can see from Bhg. para. 13 and para. 17 below, that the procedure for the pūjā of Bhaiṣajya. (always be it noted for the purpose of obtaining some desired end, always in this case, of course, a positive one) essentially parallels the procedure for

magical harm: a likeness (pratimā) of the Tathāgata is to be made ['as the pratimā of the enemy] (para. 13 and para. 17); or his name ['as the enemies'] is to be fixed in mind (para. 17); this sūtra is to be recited [as the spells] (para. 13 and para. 17) which brings into play the power of Bhaiṣaj.'s previous vows and, according to para. 12 and para. 20, the four great kings and the 12 Yakṣa-generals [as the demons]. In spite of the more elaborate detail of Bhg. para. 13 and para. 17, the similarity of their basic procedure with that summarized in our present passage is more than striking. The procedures go in different 'moral' directions and one is able to counteract the other, but clearly they move on the same plane and are of the same typology of action.

[24] The whole of section para. 10, with the exception of the initial phrase punaraparaṃ maṃjuśrīr etās catasraḥ parṣado bhikṣubhikṣuṇyupāsakopāsikā is quoted with minor variants at Śikṣā 175.3-13.

[25] Bhg. 14, 6-7: āryāṣṭāṃgaiḥ samanvāgatā; Śikṣā 175.3: -āṣṭāṅgasamanvāgatam. The connection here with the upavāsa makes it clear that the reference is to the aṣṭāṅgaśīla (see Lamotte, Histoire, 76-77) or, better, to the aṣṭāṅgapoṣadha (see BHSD $81^2 - 82^1$).

[26] Bhg. 14.12-13 has: aṣṭau bodhisattvā ṛddhyāgatā upadarśayanti te tatra nānāraṃgeṣu padmeṣūpapādukā prādurbhaviṣyanti, but this is somewhat obscure and something appears to have dropped out. Śikṣā. 175.6-7 perhaps preserves a better reading: 'ṣṭau bodhisattvā ṛddhyāgatya mārgam upadarśayanti / te tatra nānāraṅgeṣu padmeṣūpapādukāḥ prādurbhavanti. In translating we have followed the reading of Śikṣā. That the 'they' of the phrase 'they, miraculously produced, will become manifest there [in Sukhāvatī sitting] in various colored lotuses' refers to the dying individuals and not to the bodhisattvas, is clear from such a passage as Sukha. (Vaidya) 249.4 ff (para. 41).

The reference here, even more than at Bhg. para. 5, is explicitly to the Sukhāvatī of Amitāyus. This reference is intriguing in that, if our interpretation of the passage is correct, it clearly shows that hearing the name of Bhaiṣaj. is, in addition to its other benefits, conducive to rebirth in Sukhāvatī, and implies that perhaps at some point the cult of Bhaiṣajya. came to be linked up with the cult of Amitāyus. But see the similar linkage at SP 419.1 (Kern ed.) Samādhi-Rāja (Dutt ed.) 350.15; 451.13.

[27] See Śikṣā. 69.13 ff, Daśabhūmika (Vaidya ed.) 15.8-12. It is interesting that establishing beings in 'the ten good paths of action' is here a function of kingship.

[28] In Dutt's ed., the whole of our section para. 11 forms the conclusion to the preceding paragraph and is not separated from it. In his ed. the sentence begins: yaś ca mātṛgrāma tasya, etc. But as his critical apparatus shows both his Ms. A and C have instead: yena punar mātṛgrāmeṇa tasya. Śikṣa 175.14 preserves this same reading. This reading, esp. the punar, suggests that perhaps this sentence forms a separate section. And this is supported by the way in which Śikṣā 175.14 ff quotes it. The latter quotes it as a separate section even though its citation of it immediately follows the citation of the whole of our para. 10. If they had formed one section this would not have been necessary.

In translating we have followed Śikṣā. rather than Bhg.; the chief variation between the two is in the construction of the verb in the subordinate clause. Bhg. has nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā codgrahīṣyati, while Śikṣā reads nāmadheyam śrutaṃ bhaviṣyati / udgṛhītam vā /. Judging from Dutt's critical apparatus Ms. A and C might also support this reading.

[29] This is formulaic and belongs to the vocabulary of the cult of the book; see AsP 57, Aparimitāyuḥ para. 3, etc. On the cult of the book see G. Schopen, "The Phrase 'sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet' in the Vajracchedikā: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna" to be published in the Indo-Iranian Journal. To this latter should be added the following passage from the

Saṃdhinirmocana which gives some indication of how the cult of the book was incorporated into the more 'sophisticated' notions of the path and what place was assigned to it in such schemes. As a part of a longish section on the different levels at which the teaching may be understood (Ch. VII, 1 ff) we read: "Ils songent: 'nous ne comprenons pas le sens de ces discours'; mais ils les acceptent. Ils disent: 'l'illumination des Buddha est profonde; profonde aussi la nature des choses. Le Tathāgata sait; nous ne savons pas. La prédication des Tathāgata pénètre chez les êtres par toutes sortes d'adhésions. Le savoir et la vue des Tathāgata sont infinis; notre savoir et notre vue sont simplement comme la foulée du boeuf'. Dans cet esprit, ils estiment ces discours, les transcrivent, les conservent, les transmettent, les répandent, les vénèrent, les enseignent, les lisent et les étudient. Toutefois, comme ils ne comprennent pas ma formule à intention cachée, ils sont incapables d'en pratiquer la méditation. Ainsi donc, leurs équipements en mérite et savoir prennent de l'ampleur et, finalement, ceux qui n'avaient pas mûri la série parviennent à la mûrir" (É. Lamotte, Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra: L'explication des mystères (Louvain: 1935) 200).

30 The procedure of wrapping the book in cloths of five colors is not, to my knowledge, mentioned elsewhere; cf. AsP 506. -- 'On a purified spot': sucau pradeśe. The spot (pṛthivīpradeśa)

on which the book is set up is extremely important; cf. Vaj. 12 and 15c and the article referred to in the previous note. See also Bhg. para. 13 below for further reference to the "purified spot".

[31] 'where, only' = yatraiva. The recitation or ritual setting up of the book at a certain spot has the effect of drawing devas and other powerful beings to that spot. This is one reason why such places are able to become places of refuge and protection and sources of power. Cf. Amoghapāśahṛdaya (ed. R. O. Meisezahl, Monumenta Nipponica (1962) 17) 313.15-21: And again, O Blessed One, on which spot of earth this Amoghapāśahṛdaya would circulate (pracaret), it is to be known that on that spot of earth, O Blessed One, 12 X 100,000 deva-putras headed by Īśvaras, Maheśvaras and the devas belonging to Brahma will dwell for the purpose of protecting and shielding and guarding it. That spot of earth, O Blessed One, where this Amoghapāśahṛdaya will circulate will become a highly honored sacred place"; AsP 83: "The Lord said: Well said, Kauśika. Moreover, when someone repeats this perfection of wisdom, many hundreds of Gods will come near, many thousands, many hundreds of thousands of Gods, so as to listen to the dharma." (Conze's trans. p. 32)

32 The text has -vibhāgam; this should probably read -vibhaṅgam as at Bhg. 2.1.

33 cf. AsP 50, 56, 83 ff. etc.

34 'pratimā': see Bhg. para. 9 and final note to that section. Dutt in his introduction (p. 57) takes pratimā as "image", but in light of its usage at Bhg. para. 9, it is perhaps better to take it as 'a likeness' which may or may not be an "image".

35 The text here has āryāṣṭāmgamārga-; cf. Bhg. para. 10 and note .

36 susnātagātreṇa śucivimalavasanadhāriṇa; cf. Suvarṇa (Nobel ed.) 3, 4, 78, 70, 150, etc.

37 Read with Ms. A and C: durnimittaṃ vā paśyati, etc.

38 ananyadevatāś ca bhavanti: the meaning of ananyadeva (-tā) which BHSD 20[1] says is "implausible", is clearing the meaning intended here.

39 From 'which beings uphold...to...rebirths to be expected' is quoted, with variants, at Śikṣā. 174.1-6.

40 After this and before the next item Śikṣā. adds: ye daśa śikṣāpadāni dhārayanti. Dutt's Ms. C has the same reading except that it adds a final ca.

[41] Bhg. 19.15 has pamcādhike dve śikṣāpadaśate; Śikṣā. has pañcāśādhike dve śikṣāpadaśate.

[42] Śikṣā. adds: yathā vibhavataś ca pūjāṃ kuryuḥ ['and according (to their) means would perform puja'.] Ms. A has: tathāgatasta pūjāṃ kurvanti.

[43] Neither Śikṣā (which has simply apāyagati) nor Ms. A (apāyaduḥkam) support Dutt's emendation: [try] -apāya-*.

[44] Here again (as at para. 11) one suspects that this passage concerned with women should form a separate section; but in this instance there is no textual evidence to support it. The Śikṣā. quotes the whole of para. 14 except for this passage, but this by itself can be of no support.

[45] From here to '...bound to [only] one birth, the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas.' is quoted -- again with variants -- at Śikṣa. 174.7-175.2.

[46] Śikṣā omits -ārhataḥ samyaksambuddhasya.

[47] 'Both the sun...false utterance': for a similar figure of speech used to establish the same point cf. Divya. 268.272: "'le ciel tombera avec la lune et les étoiles, la terre s'élèvera dans les cieux avec les montagnes et les forêts; les océans seront

taris; mais les grands sages ne disent rien à faux'" (Lamotte, Histoire, 210). The insistence on the Buddha being ananyathāvadin is found very frequently in the sūtra literature (Vaj. 14e and Conze's note SOR XIII, 94, Śūraṃgama (Lamotte) para. 142) and is a constant theme of SP (K & N ed. 32.16, 49.2, 82.6, 92.4, 131.11, 274.10, 308.8, etc. cf. Kino Kazuyoshi "On the Influence of the Vajracchedikā upon the Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra" IBK 10 (1962) 25-29.

48 Bhg. reads: ...idaṃ buddhagocaraṃ śrutvā evaṃ vakṣyanti / katham etan nāmadheyasmaraṇamātreṇa tasya tathāgatasya tāvanto guṇānuśaṃśa bhavanti / in Śikṣā, the phraseology is considerably different: ...teṣāṃ evaṃ bhavati / katham idaṃ nāmadheyaṃ smaraṇamātreṇa tasya tathāgatasya ettakā guṇānuśaṃśa bhavati.

49 'The Blessed One said...not occur'.: Bhg. : asthānam ānandānavakāśo yena tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutaṃ tasya sattvasya durgatyapāyagamanaṃ bhaven nedaṃ sthānaṃ vidyate duḥśraddhānīyaṃ cānanda buddhānāṃ buddhagocaram /; but Śikṣā: asthānam ānandānavakāśo yeṣāṃ tasya nāmadheyaṃ nipatet karṇe teṣāṃ durgatyapāyagamanaṃ bhaved iti' duḥśraddhānīyaś cānanda buddhānāṃ buddhagocaraḥ /. From Śikṣā it would appear that the punctuation of Bhg. could be improved by putting a daṇḍa between vidyate and duḥśraddhānīyaṃ.

Rouse (C. Bendall & W. H. D. Rouse, Śikshā-Samuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine (reprint Delhi: 1971) 170) has badly

misunderstood the text: "'If his name, Ānanda, shall fall on the ear of any out of place and out of season, they would go to a life of misery and misfortune.'"

[50] abhūmir atra sarvaśravakapratyekabuddhānām sthāpayitvaikajāti- [prati] -baddhān bodhisattvān mahāsattvān iti. Two points in regard to this sentence: first, the Ms. tradition seems to have -ekajātibaddhān; Śikṣā. has ekajātipratibaddhān and the Tib. skye ba [Dutt has skyeb] gcig gis thogs pa (rnams) is the usual equivalent for ekajātipratibaddhā, Dutt says (p.22,n.11): "Evidently our scribe did not know the word ekajātipratibaddhā"; but that is perhaps too quick an assumption and the Ms. reading could be nothing more than the result of a mere scribal error. On the other hand, ekajātipratibaddhā, in its stereotyped occurrence, at least, is usually made more specific. This occurrence is as a part of a formulaic characterization of the Bodhisattva found in the nidāna to any number of mahāyāna sūtras: SP (Vaidya) 1.20, Suvarṇa. (Vaidya) 1.5-6: ekajātipratibaddhair yad uta anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau [which in itself is an intriguing idiom which has yet to be accounted for]. The second point here is that the construction of the sentence seems to imply that 'those bound to only [one] birth, the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas' are a group within the larger group of 'all disciples and pratyekabuddhas'. Compare Saṃdhinirmocana VII, 16: "Quant au Śrāvaka qui s'est tourné vers l'illimination,

je prétends, par équivalence, qu'il est Bodhisattva" [ñan thos byaṅ chub tu yoṅs su 'gyur ba gaṅ yin pa de ni ṅas rnam graṅs kyis byaṅ chub sems dpa' yin par bstan te /].

51 'Trāṇamukta: not, to my knowledge, mentioned elsewhere.

52 For background to the use of vijñāna in this sense see L. de la Vallée-Poussin, Nirvāṇa (Paris: 1925) 28 and n.2.

53 cf. Śikṣā. 206.11 ff. [from Rājāvavādaka-Sūtra].

54 pratinivarteta (also nivarteta a few lines further down): the text does not enable us to know for certain if the vijñāna 'returns' to the dying individual, i.e., he is restored to 'health'; or if its 'return' refers to a new incarnation. In that the vijñāna is actually brought before Yama (and thus the individual is, in some sense, definitely dead), the second alternative would seem most likely. The individual upon re-gaining 'consciousness' "reflects on [that] self [and its experience before Yama] as if it had occurred in a dream [svapnāntaragatā ivātmānaṃ saṃjānīte], not as having occurred in a dream.

55 i.e., as a consequence of that taking refuge and performing pūjā.

56 mahato vyādhitaḥ parimocitukāmās; Ms. C: mahāntaḥ vyādhayaḥ. Again the ambiguity noted above: 'release' could mean

restoration to health or freedom from suffering by death, i.e., a new birth.

[57] veditavyaṃ sarvasaṃpad iti.

[58] Snellgrove & Richardson (A Cultural History of Tibet (London: 1968) 110) in referring to bar do ritual say: "The older Buddhist orders and Bon-pos practice this rite, and while its 'theology' is based upon the Indian Buddhist 'Five Buddha' complex ...the whole conception of guiding a departed consciousness, which to all intents and purposes is an erring soul (despite determined orthodox Buddhist arguments against any enduring principle of personality), through this 'Intermediate State' of forty-nine days duration is manifestly of non-Buddhist origin." Now, although the evidence supplied by our text is both too meager and too ambiguous for any definite statement, it does seem that it is sufficient to form a basis for the serious questioning of such a view.

[59] 'Plague': saṃkrāmakavyādhi: nod 'go ba = (?) 'go ba'i nod.

[60] tadā tasya rājñaḥ kṣatriyasya mūrdhābhiṣiktasya etena kuśalamūlena ca tasya bhagavato, etc. Tib.: dge ba'i rtsa ba de daṅ, etc. In translating we have followed the Tib. placement of the ca (=daṅ); but cf. Bhg. 6,8-9 (para. 10,4): ..., mama

nāmadheyasya śravaṇena madīyena puṇyānubhavena ca sarvabhayopadravebhyaḥ parimucyeran.

61 Paragraph 18 as a whole: bearing in mind that the ritual of para. 17 is to be repeated in para. 18 compare the beginning of Ch. 5 of 'The Sūtra on Perfect Wisdom Which Explains How Benevolent Kings May Protect Their Countries', Conze restores as 'Kāruṇikā-rāja prajñāpāramitā?" Lamotte (VKn. 412) refers to T.245 as 'Manuṣyendraprajñāpāramitā: "The Buddha said to the great kings: 'Listen attentively, listen attentively! Now I shall explain on your behalf the Law Protecting the Country. In all countries, when riots are imminent, calamities are descending, or robbers are coming in order to destroy (the houses and possessions of) the inhabitants, you, the kings, ought to receive, keep and read this Prajñāpāramitā, solemnly to adorn the place of worship, to place (there) a hundred Buddha images, a hundred images of bodhisattvas, a hundred lion seats, and to invite a hundred Dharma-masters (priests) that they may explain this sūtra. And before the seats you must light all kinds of lamps, burn all kinds of incense, spread all kinds of flowers. You must liberally offer clothes, and bedding, food and medicine, houses, beds and seats, all offerings, and every day you must read this sūtra for two hours. If kings, great ministers, monks and nuns, male and female lay-members of the community listen to it, receive and read it, and act according to the law, the

calamities shall be extinguished" [E. Conze, The Short Prajñā-pāramitā Texts (London: 1973) 174; see also 179; M. W. de Visser, Ancient Buddhism in Japan (1928-35) I, pp.

62 This may refer to the fact that nearly all these cases (though not explicitly referred to as akālamaraṇas) and their antidotes (hearing, etc. the name of Bhaiṣaj.) have already occurred somewhere in the body of our text.

63 yadi vā vaidyā bhaiṣajyaṃ kurvanti; but Tib. yaṅ na sman pa sman ma yin par byed pa, indicating that a na has dropped out of the Skt.

64 Reading with Ms. C. amanuṣyāh; cf. Bhg. 20.8-9 (para. 14): ...na ca śakyate amanuṣyais tasya ojo 'pahartum.

65 'Twelve great Yakṣa-generals...Vikala': Dutt here refers to Suvarṇa (Jap. ed.) 81, for further reference to mahāyakṣa-senāpati.

66 'Therefore': reading with the Tib. de nas.

67 cf. SP, Ch. 26; it is not uncommon that each text has its particular 'protector' or 'protectors'.

68 The Tib. adds here two titles: byaṅ chub sems dpa' lag na rdo rjes dam bcas pa ces bya bar yaṅ bźuṅ śig = bodhisattvavajrapāṇipratijñā ity api nāma dhāraya = you bear it in mind under the name 'The Commands of Vajrapāṇi the Bodhisattva'; and for the second see above note on 'obstructions of karma' in para. 2.

69 idam avocad bhagavān. If the essential beginning of a sūtra is evaṃ mayā śrutam (/) ekasmin samaye (/), idam avocad bhagavān is just as certainly the essential conclusion. Any attempt to understand the exact significance of the evaṃ maya, etc. formula, must take full account of this equally significant and standard concluding formula and its assertion. It too is punctuated in a number of ways; see Gilgit Ms. Vol. I, pp. 32.2, 100.17; AsP (Vaidya) 261.5; Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha, I, pp. 74.17, 89.21, 253.20, etc.

Conclusion

"All grammars leak."
--Edward Sapir--

Conclusion

Perhaps one of the reasons there has been so little satisfactory work done on non-tantric Buddhist cults and cult practice is the fact that in the literature which is connected with them there is what appears to be a hopeless terminological muddle. The apparent confusion--for example--between the terms stūpa and caitya has been noted ad nauseam. The similarity of ritual action, the generalized form of pūjā directed towards different objects--the Buddha, the stūpa, the pustaka, etc.--has had the effect, for the casual reader, of blending or submerging the individuality of what appear to be, under closer scrutiny, distinct and differentiatable cult forms. Confronted with this situation the majority of scholars seem to have decided to maintain the muddle by either ignoring the cultic element altogether, or by seeing in anything vaguely ritualistic in Buddhist literature the 'beginning' or 'influence' of Tantric Buddhism: this latter, of course, is never defined nor given definitional boundaries which might set proper limits on its application as a descriptive category. As an example of the latter we may cite, P.L. Vaidya's description of the Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha-sūtra: "It seems to be one of the late sūtras, the subject of which gradually shifted from philosophical matters to worldly things such as evil doers and protection from them. We find here beginnings of later Tantric sutras"(P.L. Vaidya, Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha, pt. 1 (Darbhanga: 1961) XIV). This, of a text rich in material on the cult of the Buddha Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, on the worship of images (pratimā), on the cult of the book, and whose tantric content--judged according to the general boundaries established

by A. Bharati (The Tantric Tradition (London: 1965) p. 31)--is nil, is a great disservice to both the text in question and to Tantric Buddhism. (On the problem of over-hasty assessment of Tantric or seeemingly Tantric material see the judicious remarks of A. Wayman, The Buddhist Tantras: Light on Indo-Tibetan Esotericism (New York: 1973) 3-11.) This tendency, besides being unfair to the Tantric traditions as carefully defined by Bharati, Wayman, Guenther and others, has had the effect of categorizing almost all Buddhist ritual not clearly or classically Tantric as being early, transitional forms of the latter. This is to say that it has effectively inhibited recognizing the cults and cult practice of Buddhist sūtra/sutta literature as forming a distinct and definite category or period in the history of the development of the overall Buddhist cultus, a category or period that is to be studied by itself and in its own right, apart--in the beginning--from its Tantric off-spring. And yet it is just such a recognition which must precede any attempt to give an intelligible account of Buddhist cult practice.

Another and related factor which has done much to maintain the terminological confusion is the failure to concede to the individual elements of this terminology anything approaching an individual history. There has been little done towards even a generalized periodization of the basic vocabulary, the apparent assumption being that--for example--the terms stūpa and caitya are everywhere used with the same meaning and that in all periods the scope of their application was the same. The consequences of this have been far reaching. If we continue

to use the example of stūpa and caitya, they may be expressed like this: If the terms stūpa and caitya are sometimes used interchangeably--examples of this are far rarer than we have been led to suspect[1]--then it is safe to assume that this interchangeability is general. If, however, we attempt to verify this 'conclusion' even very superficially, we obtain some interesting results. Taking as an example of the early literature the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra, we can see that between the terms caitya--in both its non-Buddhist usage (mallānāṃ mukuṭabandhane caitye) and its Buddhist usage (āgamiṣyanti bhikṣavo mamātyayāc caityaparicārakāś caityavandakās ta evaṃ vakṣyanti / iha bhagavāñ jātaḥ, etc.)--and the term stūpa there is absolutely no interchangeability. With the Avalokana-sūtra (Śikṣāsamuccaya [Bendall ed.] 297-309; Mahāvastu [Senart, ed.] ii 362-90), a text which is difficult to place in terms of its affiliation, the interchangeability of the two terms seems obvious. But even here there is a fact of note: in the Śikṣā. version, for example, stūpa, while occurring very frequently, is always used in the singular; caitya, on the other hand, occurs only six times as singular, but fifteen times as plural, indicating, perhaps, that even here caitya retains the generic sense which in other contexts has differentiated it from stūpa. The Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, as a typical example of Mahayana Sūtra Literature, also presents an interesting situation. The term stūpa is frequent, while

[1]Often even the cases in which interchangeability seems obvious, under close investigation, exhibit a clear, if subtle, differentiation of the two terms; see for example, the remarks of M. Bénisti, "Étude sur le stūpa dans l'Inde ancienne" BEFEO 50 (1960) 74-75, on the well known passage of Divyāvadāna 242 ff.

caitya is rare; five occurrences that we have noted. All but two of these (Kern, ed. ,391.6 ff.; 414.12) occur in a context in which there is a 'confusion' of the terms caitya and stūpa, but it is a confusion of a decidedly peculiar nature. We cite the example which most clearly indicates the situation: Kern, ed.,340.6: yatra cājita sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tiṣṭhed vā niṣīded vā caṅkramed vā tatrājita tathāgatam uddiśya caityaṃ kartavyaṃ tathāgatastūpo 'yam iti ca sa vaktavyaḥ sadevakena lokeneti: and where, O Ajita, that son or daughter of family [who preserves the SP] would stand or sit or walk around, there, Ajita, in the name of the Tathāgata a caitya is to be made, and by the world with its devas it is to be said: 'This is a stūpa of the Tathāgata'. To describe what is happening here as 'confusion' is difficult. It appears, rather, to be a case in which there is a conscious attempt on the part of its author to fuse what he obviously perceived to be two distinct terms, into one. A similar situation, although perhaps less clearly, is to be seen in SP 231.7-232.3; 339.6 ff. The use of caitya at SP 391.6 ff. is also to be noted. It has preserved intact the use of the term in probably one of its earliest applications; i.e., to refer to the four places central to the career of Śākyamuni: his place of birth, enlightenment, etc. (here it refers to the symbolic equivalents of these places.) Finally, to complete our very sketchy chronological tour, we must cite an example of late Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature. In the Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhānasattvāvalokanabuddhakṣetrasandarśanavyūha-sūtra (N. Dutt, Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. 1 (Srinagar: 1939) 49-89; abbrev.=STA) the term stūpa occurs only once (staupika, also occurs once, 73.7). This is in a

standard kind of passage comparing the relative merit of--in this case--one who would write, preserve, etc., this dharmaparyāya and he who vihāracaṃkramodyānaṃ kārāpaye ardhayojanocchritam saptaratnamayaṃ stūpaṃ kāraye śataṃ vā sahasraṃ vā (STA, 79.10). The corresponding gāthā version has simply: yaś caiva buddhesv abhiśraddadhitvā/ vihāra kārāpayi caityakāni /. Superficially this could appear as a case of interchange, but it is perhaps better to understand caityaka here as a generic term standing for both stūpa and caṃkramodyāna of the prose. The same pattern holds for the second half of the verse where sūtraṃ [ca] dhareti alone stands for likhe likhāpaye dhāraye vācaye pūjaye satkare parebhyaś ca vistareṇa saṃprakāśye of the prose.[2] In addition to this STA presents two similar cases of a very interesting use of the term caitya. STA 68.14, in giving directions for a complex ritual of pūjā, recitation, etc., says it is to take place sadhātuke cait[y]āyatane = sku gduṅ daṅ bcas pa'i mchod rten gyi gnas su (TPP 27,275-2-8) = at the site of a caitya possessed of relics. In a very similar context, STA 77.2 places its ritual sadhātuke caityasthāne = mchod rten sku dguṅ daṅ bcas pa'i gnas su. If for the author of STA stūpa and caitya were interchangeable, and stūpa was invariably associated with relics (as is usually assumed), then it is difficult to see why in these two instances he did not simply use the much simpler and more 'standard' term, stūpa.

[2]It is perhaps of some interest to note that the Tibetan version has nothing to correspond to caityaka: TPP Vol. 27, 278-3-3, gaṅ gis saṅs rgyas la ni dad byas te / tshad med gtsug lag khaṅ dag brtsigs pa (bas) / who having faith in the Buddha, constructs innumerable (apramāṇa, apramita) vihāras, etc.

It appears rather that we must conclude that for the author of *STA* there were *caityas* ("shrines") other than *stūpas* which had or were associated with relics. This is perhaps supported by the fact that he refers to images (*pratimā*) of both the Tathāgata and Avalokiteśvara as being *sadhātukā* (68.13).[3]

One thing at least is clear from these few test-cases: the situation is much more complex and far richer than a simple case of confusion. Further, they would seem to indicate that a close and systematic investigation of these terms would hold great promise of arriving at a more accurate and richer understanding of not only these two terms, but of much else connected with the cultic tradition of Buddhist sūtra literature. And the case of the relationship between the terms *stūpa* and *caitya* is only an example. Many others spring to mind, such as the cluster, *śarīra*/*dhātu*/*ātmabhāva*/*vigraha*/*rūpakāya*, all of which require systematic investigation.

---

[3]We might add here a number of points. First, *STA* 75.3 in place of *sadhātuke caityasthāne*, etc., has *śucau pradeśe kartavyam devāyatane vā* = *sa phyogs gtsaṅ ma 'am lha'i gnas su* (*PTT* 27,276-5-1) = on a pure spot it is to be done or at a deva-site (Cf. Pali *devaṭṭhāna*, *Mil.* 91, 330 (I.B. Horner, *Milindas' Questions*, Vol. I [SBB 22] (London: 1964) 127 n. 4); *Dha* iii 251.2 (*devaṭṭhāna*); 251.4 (*āgatacetiyaṭṭhāna*)), which indicates a little more fully the possible contours of *caityāyatana*, *-sthāna*. Second, for *STA* 68.14 Dutt gives both in his edition and in his partial index the form *caitāyatane*, implying thereby that this is a legitimate form. But this seems unlikely; *caita* as a form of *caitya* is nowhere recorded (Edgerton, *BHSD* 232-33, cites *ceti*, *cetika*, *cetiya*, *caitya*, and *caityaka*, but not *caita*), and *STA* 77.2 and the Tib. all indicate the reading *caitya*. If *caita-* is the true reading of the Ms, then it is probably a scribal error and should be emended to *caitya-* . Lastly we might suggest a minor correction to F.A. Bischoff's translation of the Tib. version of the *Mahābala-sūtra* (F.A. Bischoff, *Ārya Mahābala-Nāma-Mahāyāna-Sūtra* (Paris: 1958)). *Mahābala* 19c reads: *goṅ du smos pa'i cho ga bźin du* / *phyogs gyi cha 'am* // *kluṅ gi ṅogs sam* // *rgya mtso'i 'gram 'am* // *mtso 'gram* // *mchod rten gyi gnas sam* [v.l, *gnas su*] / *byaṅ chub sems dpa' lag na rdo rje* / *la mchod pa chen po byas te* // which Bischoff translates: "On fait un grand

There is yet another note to these remarks. Any investigation of this terminology must be fully and critically aware of the manuscript traditions on which it is based, and must take full account of the fact that--to judge by the material available to us-- it is often times just this vocabulary which has undergone the greatest change when moving from one manuscript tradtion to another. We cite at length the instance of the 33rd chapter of the Samādhirāja because it so profusely illustrates our point. We will also occasionally refer to the 22nd chapter of the Saddharampuṇḍarīka, a text narrating similar events, as a source for comparison. For the Samādhirāja we are at present able to refer to the Gilgit version (=C) as edited by N. Dutt (Gilgit Manuscripts Vol. II, pt. 3 (Calcutta: 1954) 455 ff.; also P.L. Vaidya, Samādhirājasūtra (Darbhanga: 1961) 218 ff., which is essentially a copy of Dutt minus his brackets in the text and much of his critical apparatus; and to the variant readings from two Nepalese manuscripts (=A and B) cited by him.[4]

---

sacrifice (pūjā) au Bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi selon le rite exposé en premier, soit sur une partie de terrain, sur la berge d'un fleuve, au bord de la mer, au bord d'un lac, sur un site de stūpa". In light of STA 68.14 and 77.2, and noting the similarity in the context of these two and Mahābala 19c, it is perhaps better to translate mchod rten gyi gnas [su] as 'on the site of a caitya' and assume the original Skt. to have been something like STA 68.14's cait[y]āyatane = mchod rten gyi gnas su.

[4] We are in this instance at Dutt's mercy, and experience has shown (compare for example his ed. of MSV i 73.16-79.2 and the variants cited there from Divy. with the text of Divy. as it is printed in the ed. of Cowell and Neil 76.10-80.9 and 465.10-469.18) that he is not always fully accurate or complete in the citation of variants. We should also point out that there is a partial translation of this chapter of SR in J. Filliozat, "La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", JA, (1963) 22-27, but the passages we are primarily concerned with he does not translate.

It is well to keep two things in mind: first, but for the Gilgit manuscript, we would be reading—as we must for most texts—the Nepalese version; and second, even the Gilgit version shows signs of having been tampered with.

Then the Blessed One again addressed Candraprabha, the heir-apparent: [here A, B and Tib. add a passage of about 16 lines. For the sake of space we will not translate it in full, but give only a single extract which gives the gist of the whole: 'Kumāra, by that Bodhisattva, Mahāsattva having produced a thought of support for all beings, wanting this Samādhi and desiring to completely awaken to the utmost, right and complete awakening quickly, dwelling in the signless, not waiting for the maturation of acts being lived through in his own-body even (karmavipākāpratikāṅkṣiṇā svakāyajīvitenāpi), the performance of the highest pūjā towards the caityas of an abiding or parinirvāṇed Tathāgata is to be done (tiṣṭhatām vā parinirvṛtānām tathāgatānām caityeṣūdārapūjābhisaṃskārah karaṇīyaḥ; this interesting expression occurs three times in this passage). And this Samādhi-[rāja] of the explicitly declared own-being of all dharmas, with a beautiful and charming voice, with distinguished speech, with connected words and allusions, by one having the support of great compassion, by one having accomplishment of thought, it is to be illumined in detail for others, set going, etc.' The whole passage follows a similar vein. It is an exhortation to the potential Bodhisattva to do pūjā of the caityas

and to teach the Samādhirāja. An exhortation which will be illustrated by the story that follows and was clearly added as a kind of preface.] Formerly, O, heir-apparent, in a past time, immeasurable kalpas, more immeasurable, extensive, limitless, unthinkable, incalculable [kalpas ago], when at that time, on that occassion appeared in the world Ghoṣadatta by name, a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha, endowed with knowledge and conduct, Well-Gone, knower of the world, utmost leader of tamable men, a Teacher of Devas and Men, a Buddha, a Blessed One. He, again Kumāra, Ghoṣadatta, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha, having established immeasurable, unthinkable, measureless, incalculable beings in Arhat-ship for the exhaustion of (their) outflows, having parinirvāṇized [them], having established immeasurable and incalculable beings in utmost, right and complete Awakening, in the state of being irreversible, he was parinirvāṇed. And, Kumāra, at that time, at that period, the king was Śrīghoṣa by name. He, for the purpose of worshipping that Tathāgata, had constructed Tathāgata-relic chambers, [and] 84 koṭis of thousands of stūpas ([sa] tasya tathāgatasya pūjārthaṃ tathāgatadhātugarbhāṇi (C: -garbhāṇāṃ) caturaśītistūpakoṭisahasrāṇi kārayāmāsa. Cf. SP 411.11 where the number is caturaśītistūpasahasrāṇi) and on every single stūpa (B: -smiṃś ca stūpeṣu) he had fixed 84 x 84 x a half of a koṭi of niyutas of 100s of 1000s of lamps. At every single stūpa he thus had offered 84 x 84 x koṭis of 100s of 1000s of music, of turyas, of flowers, incenses,

perfumes, garlands, unguents, aromatic powders, cloths, umbrellas, flags and banners. For thus, Kumāra, that King Śrīghoṣa having done pūjā of the relics of the Tathāgata (tathāgataśarīrāṇām pūjām kṛtvā; but A: -gatadhātugarbhāṇām stūpānām; B: śrīghoṣadattas tathāgate dhāturṇbhāṇām (?; = -garbhāṇām) stūpānām. The Nepalese ms. show a definite shift of emphasis in reference to the object of worship from relics to stūpa. Cf. SP 412.3 (the context is almost exactly parallel): kṛtā mayā...tathāgatasya dhātūnām pūjā...with the following variants all from Nepalese Mss.: -gatasya stūpānām, A.: -gatadhātū, B.,Ca.; -gatasya dhātūnām, Cb.; -gatasya stūpānām dhātu, K.; -gatasya dhātūnām, W; thus exhibiting a similar tendency to shift in the same direction), having effected a great assembly of bodhisattvas of 84 koṭis of niyutas of 100s of 1000s of bodhisattvas, he was engaged in worshipping with all that is required for ease those bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas. And all those bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas were reciters of Dharma, having unbroken (verbal) inspiration, having obtained the Samādhis, having obtained the unattached dhāraṇīs, preachers of the Dharma of true qualities, completely purified preachers of Dharma, having obtained the supreme mastery of a bodhisattva. And Kumāra at that time, on that occasion, there in just that assembly was a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, named Kṣemadatta, a child young in age, having black hair. Abiding in the beauty accompanied with early youth, in health, without having sport among desires, a youthful Brahmacārin being ordained for one year. And, Kumāra, at that time, and on that occasion the King Śrīghoṣa requested that great group of Bodhisattvas, Mahāsattvas, namely in a singing of the six perfections for the

sake of accomplishment of the Bodhisattvapiṭaka, the great dhāraṇīs, skill in means, control, discipline and non-attachment. Having requested those bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, when night had fallen, there before the caitya of the Tathāgata (tathāgata-caityasya purataḥ. How we got from tathāgatadhātugarbhāṇi caturaśītistūpakoṭisahasrāṇi to a single tathāgatacaitya is a little puzzling, and, to judge from the Nepalese Mss., we are not the first to have difficulties in following this transition. Ms. A has -gatadhātugarbhāṇām caityānām purataḥ; B has: -gata-dhātugarbhāṇām cainā purataḥ. The readings of the Nepalese Mss. appear to be conscious attempts to revise the line so that it agrees with what came before it in the text. The retention in C, on the other hand, of the single caitya raises the initial doubt concerning the originality of the preceding tathāgatadhātu-garbhāṇi caturaśītistūpakoṭisahasrāṇi.) several half-koṭis of niyutas of 100s of 1000s of lamps were lighted and (that) whole maṇḍala (maṇḍalamātraḥ) was made besprinkled, well cleansed and purified, being covered with flowers, having arranged manifold and varigated couches and seats. Further the Rāja Śrīghoṣa, with his harem, spectators from villages, cities and the country side, with townsmen, departed [from his palace]. With music, tūryas, tāḍāvacara, flowers, incenses, perfumes, garlands, unguents, aromatic powders, cloths, umbrellas, flags and banners taken along, having done pūjā of the caitya of the Tathāgata (tathā-gatacaityaṣya pūjāṃ kṛtvā; A: -gatadhātugarbhāṇāṃ caityānāṃ; B: tānis tathāgatadhātugarbhāṇāṃ ccaityānāṃ. Here again the

Nepalese Mss. have 'revised' the text in the same way as before.), he together with his harem [returned and] mounted to the roof of the palace for the sake of hearing dharma. And a great assembly consisting of Devas and men was assembled for the sake of hearing Dharma. And Kṣemadatta, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, saw those great half of koṭis of niyutas of 100s of 1000s of lamps blazing. By just that illumination he was filled. And having observed that multitude consisting of Devas and men assembled for the sake of hearing Dharma, this occurred to him: 'I also am set out on the great vehicle; suppose now I desiring (this) Samādhi would perform pūjā of the Tathāgata. By such-like pūjā (as) the world together with its devas, men and asuras would have obtained respect, would be transported in mind, overjoyed, having produced gladness and cheerfulness, I, having obtained the light of Dharma, would surpass all that pūjā of the Tathāgata [as well as] that which was done by the King Śrīghoṣa and [by which] the King Śrīghoṣa would have obtained respect, his mind transported, gladdened, having produced gladness and cheerfulness, being surrounded by his harem.

Then moreover, Kṣemadatta, the Bodhisattva, Mahāsattva, having a mind thus, having produced gladness and cheerfulness, having observed that great assembled multitude when the night fell for (those) listening to Dharma, having stood in front of the shrine of the Tathagata (tathāgatacaityasya puratah; with no variants. The 'revision' carried on in the Nepalese Mss. has

not been--as is often the case with similar 'revisions'--thoroughly acquitted. The situation in SP is instructive. Here we have the act taking place teṣāṃ caturaśītīnāṃ tathāgata-dhātu-[A.,W. add -garbha-; Cb. reads dhātūnāṃ stūpānām]-stūpasahasrāṇāṃ puras (SP 412.9) which at best is difficult to conceive), having wrapped with clothe (his)right arm, having soaked it with oil, he set it afire.

It is clear from a comparison of the Ms. material available for this passage that if we had access only to the Nepalese redaction we would be reading an account in which the 'standard' vocabulary was of a decidedly more elaborate nature. Beyond this moreover, the account as it stands in the Gilgit Ms., the fact that there is a clumsy shift in the narrative from koṭis of stūpas to a single Tathāgatacaitya, with the latter being, apart from the introductory sequence, the standard expression, allows us to posit not unreasonably an even earlier version which had reference to only a single Tathāgatacaitya. The stereotypical nature of the number 84 x, and of other elements of the introductory sequence (Cf. the account at SP 412 ff.) lends some support to this.[5] Finally, the textual situation of the Samadhiraja dictates that we question, that we treat with caution the similar elaborate

---

[5]The only other accounts known to me which describe this ritual act, though too short to serve as an effective source of comparison, are of some interest. At Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā (Finot Ed.) 23.1, the act takes place jinadhātustūpapurato; at Jātaka (Fausbøll, Ed.) i 31.21 F = Madhuratthavilāsilinī nāma Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā (Horner Ed.) 143.37 FF., it takes place ekassa buddhassa...cetiyaṃ padakkhiṇaṃ karonto... .

vocabulary of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, based as it primarily is on the Nepalese Ms. tradition.

These few points, then, serve both as a critique of previous work done on our literature, and as a programme for any future work which may be undertaken in this area. We ourselves (the Pope and I) hope to have some share in this future work.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Sanskrit Texts.

Bendall, C., Śikṣāsamuccaya (St. Petersburg: 1902).

Cakravarti, N.P., "The Gilget Text of the Vajracchedikā" in G. Tucci, Minor Buddhist Texts, pt. I (Rome: 1956), 182-92.

Conze, E., Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā (Rome: 1957).

Cowell, E.B. and R.A. Neil, The Divyāvadāna (Cambridge: 1886; reprint, 1969).

Dutt, N., "Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharājasūtram", Indian Historical Quarterly, supplement to Vol. 12, No. 2 (1936) and No. 3 (1936).

________, Gilgit Manuscripts [Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra], Vol. I (Srinagar: 1939) 1-32.

________, Gilgit Manuscripts [Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhānasattvāvalokana-buddhakṣetrasandarśanavyūha-sūtra] Vol. I (Srinagar: 1939) 49-89.

________, Gilgit Manuscripts [Samādhirājasūtra] Vol. II, pt. 1 (Srinagar: 1941); pt. 2 (Calcutta: 1953); pt. 3 (Calcutta: 1954).

________, Gilgit Manuscripts [Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya], Vol. III, pt. 1 (Srinagar: 1947); pt. 2 (Srinagar: 1942); pt. 3 (Srinagar: 1943); pt. 4 (Calcutta: 1950).

________, Gilgit Manuscripts [Vajracchedikā] Vol. IV (Calcutta: 1959) 141-70.

________, Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram: With N.D. Mironov's Readings From Central Asian Mss. (Calcutta: 1952).

Finot, L., Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā. Sūtra du Mahāyāna (St. Petersburg: 1901).

Kanga, Takahata, Ratnamālāvadāna (Tokyo: 1954).

Kern, H. and B. Nanjio, Saddharma Puṇḍarīka (St. Petersburg: 1908-12).

Konow, S., "The Aparimitāyuḥ Sūtra, The Old Khotanese Version Together With the Sanskrit Text and the Tibetan Translation", in A.F.R. Hoernle, Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan (Oxford: 1916) 289-329.

Konow, S. "The Vajracchedikā in the Old Khotanese Version of Eastern Turkestan", in A.F.R. Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan* (Oxford: 1916) 214-288.

La Vallee Poussin, L. de, *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjika* (Calcutta: 1909-14).

Levi, S., *Mahākarmavibhanga et Karmavibhangopadeśa* (Paris: 1932).

________, "Une poésie inconnue du roi Harṣa Śilāditya", *Actes du Xe Congrès international des orientalistes*, Vol. II (Leiden: 1895) 189-203.

Meisezahl, R.O., "The Amoghapāśahṛdaya-dhāraṇī, The Early Sanskrit Manuscript of the Reiunji Critically Edited and Translated", *Monumenta Nipponica*, 17(1962) 264-328.

Mitra, R., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā* (Calcutta: 1888).

Muller, F.M., *Buddhist Texts From Japan. I. Vajracchedikā* (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Aryan Series, Vol. 1, pt. 1), (Oxford: 1881).

Nobel, J., *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra, Das Goldglanz-Sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus* (Leipzig: 1937).

Obermiller, E., *Prajñā-Pāramitā-Ratna-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā* (Leningrad: 1937).

Pargiter, F.E., "Vajracchedikā in the Original Sanskrit", in A.F.R. Hoernle, *Manscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan* (Oxford: 1916) 176-95.

Sastri, N.A., *Āryaśālistamba Sūtra* (Adyar: 1950).

Senart, E., *Le Mahāvastu* (Paris: 1882-97).

Stael-Holstein, Baron A. Von, *The Kāśyapaparivarta, A Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Ratnakuṭa Class* (Shanghai: 1926).

Suzuki, D.T. and H. Idzumi, *Gaṇḍavyūha-Sūtra* (Kyoto: 1936).

Vaisya, P.L., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary Called Āloka* (Darbhanga: 1960).

Vaidya, P.L., *Avadānaśataka* (Darbhanga: 1958).

__________, *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabharājusūtram*, in Vaidya, *Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha*, pt. 1 (Darbhanga: 1961) 165-73.

__________, *Divyāvadāna* (Darbhanga: 1959)

Vaidya, P.L., Lalitavistara (Darbhanga: 1958).

__________, Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram (Darbhanga: 1960).

__________, Samādhirājasūtra (Darbhanga: 1961).

__________, Sukhāvatīvyūhah (Vistaramātṛkā), in Vaidya, Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha, pt. 1 (Darbhanga: 1961) 221-53.

__________, Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, in Vaidya, Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃgraha, pt. 1 (Darbhanga: 1961) 75-89.

Waldschmidt, E., Das Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra, T. III (Berlin: 1951).

__________, "Der Buddha preist die Verehrungswürdigkeit seiner Reliquien; Sondertext I des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra", Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1961, S. 375-85.

Walleser, M., Aparimitāyur-jñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtram: Nach einer nepalesischen Sanskrit-Handschrift mit der tibetischen und chinesischen Version (Heidelberg: 1916).

Wogihara, U., Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā (Tokyo: 1932-35).

__________ and C. Tsuchida, Saddharma Puṇḍarīka-Sūtram: Romanized and Revised Text (Tokyo: 1958).

Yamada, I., Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka (London: 1968).

II. Tibetan Texts.

Bischoff, F.A., *Contributions à l'étude des divinités mineures du bouddhisme tantrique: Ārya Mahābala-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra* (Paris: 1958).

Emmerick, R.E., *The Khotanese Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra* (London: 1970) 91-113.

Hashimoto, K. and R. Shimizu, *Mō-zō-Bon-Kan-wa Gappeki Kongō-Hannya-Haramitsu-kyō* (Tokyo: 1941).

Jisshu Oshika, "Tibetan Text of Vimalakīrtinirdeśa", *Acta Indologica*, I (1970).

Konow, S., "The Aparimitāyuḥ Sūtra, The Old Khotanese Version Together with the Sanskrit Text and the Tibetan Translation", in A.F.R. Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan* (Oxford: 1916) 289-329.

Lamotte, E., *Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra: L'explication des mystères* (Louvain: 1935).

La Vallee Poussin, L. de, *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library* (London: 1962).

Meisezahl, R.O., "The Amoghapāśahṛdaya-dhāraṇī, The Early Sanskrit Manuscript of the Reiunji Critically Edited and Translated", *Monumenta Nipponica*, 17 (1962) 264-328.

Obermiller, E., *Prajñā Pāramitā Ratna-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā* (Leningrad: 1937).

Stael-Holstein, Baron A. Von, *The Kāśyapaparivarta, A Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Ratnakuta Class* (Shanghai: 1926).

Suzuki, D.T., *The Tibetan Tripitaka* (Peking Edition) (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1956): listed according to volume number:

> *'phags pa de bźin gśegs pa bdun gyi sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*, Vol. 6, No. 135, 126-2-6 to 135-4-6.
>
> *'phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i oṅ kyi rgyal po'i sṅon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa źes bya ba theg pa chen pa'i mdo*, Vol. 6, No. 136, 135-4-7 to 139-2-8.

'phags pa tshe dan ye śes dpag tu med pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo, Vol. 7, No. 361, 301-4-6 to 303-5-5; Vol. 7, No. 362, 303-5-5 to 305-5-2.

śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stoṅ phrag brgya pa, Vol. 12, No. 730, 1-1-1; Vol. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 to Vol. 18, 38-3-7.

śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stoṅ phrag ñi śu lṅa pa, Vol. 18, No. 731, 39, 39-1-1 to Vol. 19, 203-1-7.

śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa khri brgyad stoṅ pa, Vol. 19, No. 732, 205-1-1 to Vol. 20, 205-4-8.

śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa brgyad stoṅ pa, Vol. 21, No. 734, 57-1-1 to 183-1-8.

śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa rdo rje gcod pa, Vol. 21, No. 739, 250-5-2 to 256-3-8.

'phags pa rgya cher rol pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo, Vol. 27, No. 763, 153-1-1 to 252-4-5.

'phags pa de bźin gśegs pa thams cad kyi byin gyis rlabs sems can la gzigs śiṅ saṅs rgyas kyi źiṅ gi bkod pa kun tu ston pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo, Vol. 27, No. 766, 270-5-1 to 279-3-4.

dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar pa źes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo, Vol. 30, No. 781, 1-1-1 to 84-2-5.

'dul ba gźi, Vol. 41, No. 1030, 179-3-6 to 180-4-2.

Togano, S., Śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i tshul brgya lṅa bcu pa, in Rishukyō no Kenkyo (Kyoto: 1917); reprinted in Yukichatta, Index to the Ārya-Prajñāpāramitā-Naya-Śata-Pañcāśatikā (Kyoto: 1971).

Walleser, M., Aparimitāyur-jñāna-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtram: Nach einer nepalesischen Sanskrit-Handschrift mit der tibetischen und chinesischen Version (Heidelberg: 1916).

III. Translations.

Bendall, C. and W.H.D. Rouse, Śikṣa-Samuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine (London: 1922).

Benveniste, E., Textes Sogdiens, édités, traduits et commentés (Paris: 1940).

Bischoff, F.A., Contributions à l'étude des divinités mineures du bouddhisme tantrique: Ārya Mahābala-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, (Paris: 1958).

Burnouf, E., Le lotus de la bonne loi (Paris: 1852).

Conze, E., Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (Calcutta: 1958).

________, Buddhist Wisdom Books (London: 1958)

________, Selected Sayings from the Perfection of Wisdom (London: 1955).

________, "The Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā", in Studies of Esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism, Ed. Koyasan University (Koyasan: 1965) 101-15.

________, The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts (London: 1973).

Emmerick, R.E., The Sūtra of Golden Light (London: 1970).

Filliozat, J., "La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", Journal Asiatique (1963) 22-27.

Harlez, C. de, Vajracchedikā (Prajñāpāramitā): Traduite du texte Sanscrit avec comparison des versions chinoise et mandchoue [extrait du Journal Asiatique] (Paris: 1892).

Hofinger, M., Le congrès du lac Anavatapta I: Légendes des anciens (sthavirāvadāna) (Louvain: 1956).

Jones, J.J., The Mahāvastu (London: 1949-56).

Kern, H., Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the Good Law (Oxford: 1884).

Lamotte, E., La concentration de la Marche Héroïque (Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra) (Bruxelles: 1965).

________, L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Louvain: 1962)

Lamotte, E., Le traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse; T. I (Louvain: 1949); T. II (Louvain: 1949).

_________, Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra: L'explication des mystères (Louvain: 1935).

La Vallee Poussin, L. de, L'abhidharmakośa de Vasubandu, quatrième chap. (Louvain: 1924).

Leumann, E., Buddhistische Literatur, Nordarisch und Deutsch, I. Teil: Nebenstücke (Leipzig: 1920).

Muller, F.M., "The Vajracchedikā or Diamond Cutter", in Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 49, pt. 2 (Oxford: 1894) 111-44.

Walleser, M., Prajñāpāramitā, die Vollkommenheit der Erkenntnis (Göttingen: 1914).

Weller, F., Zum Kāśyapaparivarta (Berlin: 1965).